National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE U.S. MARKET

BY

© ENID R. MARKUS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF BUSINESS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-40995-9

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: ENID R. MARKUS

TITLE OF THESIS: TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE U.S. MARKET

DEGREE: MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

E. Markus

Enid R. Markus
8726 - 181A Street
Edmonton, Alberta

Date: Oct 13/87

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE U.S. MARKET submitted by ENID R. MARKUS in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

M. James Dunn
(Supervisor)

Betty Crown

A Flinn

Date: June 17, 1987

## DEDICATION

To my husband Max with thanks for making my life as a working wife, mother and student easier in so many ways.

To Hadley and Darryl who, despite enduring lengthy periods of inattention, have grown into caring, independent children.

## ABSTRACT

An analysis of over 500 Starch tested tourism advertisements sponsored by countries, states and provinces and placed in U.S. magazines was conducted. The objective was to provide guidelines for the production of effective creative for foreign tourism destination advertisements placed in the American market.

Two sets of multiple regression analyses and a univariate analysis of each of the 326 variables examined were undertaken. Other than the Noting Scores, the dependent readership variables were expressed in the form of Rates. These control for the initial Attention level and allow the analysis to focus on variables which determine real Association with the sponsor and real Elaboration (or text readership) unconfounded by audience size. The results of the three approaches, taken together, were used to make recommendations regarding the communication, mechanical and message-content variables which should be included or avoided in tourism destination advertisements.

Since the sample of advertisements was confined to one product group, extensive analysis of message-content

variables could be undertaken. It was anticipated that these variables would make their most important contribution to text readership measures. The results showed that the actual messages being communicated both assist in catching Attention and in drawing the reader into the text. Thorough text readership, however, in common with Association and headline readership, is more dependent on mechanical or layout considerations.

One drawback to Starch tested advertisements is that the content guidelines which can be developed from analysis of these advertisements are applicable only to a broad cross-section of the audience. Target market segments which might be more receptive to particular appeals are ignored.

It was also anticipated that advertisements which carry factual information would perform better than those which were more general. Results were mixed. Overall, there was no advantage to either approach, but specific types of factual information were found to detract from readership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express appreciation to my supervisor, Professor M.J. Dunn, for his advice while carrying out this research. Thanks are also due to the members of my examination committee, Professor A. Finn who provided additional interpretive insights and Professor E.M. Crown who offered constructive criticism.

Special thanks are extended to Chuck Humphries for his unfailing helpfulness in resolving computing problems, making suggestions and keeping me on track over a lengthy period; also to Terry Taerum for the final "eureka" --- the multiple regressions could not have been carried out properly without it.

I am indebted to Alberta Tourism for providing the data used in this study and would like to acknowledge Starch INRA Hooper's contribution in making the Ad-File available at a reduced fee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | PREAMBLE | 1 |
| | THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY | 2 |
| | PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY | 5 |
| | OUTLINE | 7 |
| II. | REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 9 |
| | EARLY HISTORY | 9 |
| | CONTROVERSY OVER THE USE OF RECOGNITION MEASURES | 10 |
| | ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS TESTING USING RECOGNITION SCORES | 16 |
| | PREVIOUS RESEARCH FINDINGS | 18 |
| | GENERAL | 18 |
| | SEX AND PRODUCT CLASS | 18 |
| | MECHANICAL VS. CONTENT VARIABLES | 21 |
| | THE ROLE AND STUDY OF INFORMATION IN ADVERTISING | 26 |
| | THEORY OF INFORMATION PROCESSING | 30 |
| III. | METHODOLOGY | 34 |
| | THE STARCH READERSHIP SERVICE | 34 |
| | THE OBJECTIVE OF STARCH READERSHIP STUDIES | 34 |

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | METHODOLOGY | 34 |
| | Sample Size and Selection | 34 |
| | Interviewing Procedure | 36 |
| | Results | 36 |
| | METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENTS | 39 |
| | SELECTION OF ADVERTISEMENTS TO BE STUDIED | 39 |
| | SAMPLE SIZE OBTAINED | 40 |
| | CODING OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS | 42 |
| | Starch Readership Study Information | 42 |
| | Mechanical and Content Descriptors of the Ad | 47 |
| | DATA PROCESSING | 50 |
| | Dependent Variables | 50 |
| | Independent Variables | 55 |
| | Data Analysis | 56 |
| IV. | INDEPENDENT VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY | 60 |
| | COMMUNICATION VARIABLES | 61 |
| | VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ATTENTION | 68 |
| | VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ASSOCIATION | 79 |
| | DESTINATION NAME | 83 |
| | HEADLINE | 86 |
| | VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ELABORATION | 94 |
| | CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES | 104 |

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| V. | RESULTS | 107 |
| | A TECHNICAL NOTE | 108 |
| | THE ROLE OF CONTENT VARIABLES IN EXPLAINING VARIANCE | 110 |
| | THE DIVERGENT PROCESSING EFFECTIVENESS MODEL | 117 |
| | INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES FOR INCLUSION/ EXCLUSION IN A TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENT | 120 |
| | CONGRUENCE OF DIFFERENT ANALYTICAL APPROACHES | 120 |
| | COMMUNICATION VARIABLES | 122 |
| | Format of Ad | 123 |
| | Publication Date | 125 |
| | Sex of Reader | 126 |
| | Region Advertised | 127 |
| | Co-sponsorship of Ad | 127 |
| | Type of Magazine | 127 |
| | Position in Magazine | 128 |
| | ILLUSTRATION VARIABLES | 129 |
| | Use of Bleed | 132 |
| | Execution of Illustration | 132 |
| | Number of Illustrations | 133 |
| | Illustration Size | 133 |
| | Shape and Position of the Illustration | 134 |
| | Illustration Content Which Attracts Attention | 135 |
| | Illustration Subjects Associated with Low Attention Scores | 136 |

CHAPTER PAGE

Illustration Subjects Impacting on Elaboration 137

IDENTIFIER AND SIGNATURE VARIABLES 138

Placement in Ad Components 143

Size 146

Position in Ad 146

Presentation 147

HEADLINE 148

Presentation 148

Position in Ad 151

Size 152

Content 152

TEXT VARIABLES 153

Presentation 156

Position in Ad 156

Colour of Background and Text 157

Quantity of Text 158

Information in Text 159

Appeal/s Employed 161

Evocativeness of Text 163

CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES 163

Type of Call-to-Action Variable 166

The Coupon Itself 166

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| VI. | IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS | 168 |
| | SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION | 168 |
| | ELEMENTS IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS | 168 |
| | OPTIMAL LAYOUT OF THE ADVERTISEMENT | 169 |
| | OTHER COMMENTS ON LAYOUT | 171 |
| | OPTIMAL MESSAGE FOR THE ADVERTISEMENT | 173 |
| | OTHER COMMENTS ON MESSAGE | 174 |
| | THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS | 176 |
| | MESSAGE - CONTENT VARIABLES | 176 |
| | INFORMATION CONTENT OF THE AD | 177 |
| | INFORMATION PROCESSING | 178 |
| | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION | 180 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | 181 |
| APPENDIX A | | 185 |
| APPENDIX B | | 207 |
| APPENDIX C | | 217 |
| APPENDIX D | | 228 |

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | DESCRIPTION | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rank Order of Interests and Advertisement Readership | 19 |
| 2 | Changes in Magazine Advertising | 24 |
| 3 | Sample Size and Distribution | 41 |
| 4 | Intercorrelation of Dependent Variables Using Scores and Rates | 52 |
| 5 | Starch Scores and Readership Rates | 53 |
| 6 | Communication Variables | 62 |
| 7 | Mechanical Variables Pertaining To The Illustration | 69 |
| 8 | Content Variables Relating to The Pictorial Message | 74 |
| 9 | Variables Relating To The Destination Name and Starch Identified Signature | 80 |
| 10 | Mechanical and Content Headline Variables | 87 |
| 11 | Mechanical Variables Relating To The Text | 95 |
| 12 | Content Variables Relating To The Written Message | 101 |
| 13 | Mechanical Call-To-Action Variables | 105 |
| 14 | Separate and Combined Predictions Of Three Types of Variables on Readership | 111 |
| 15 | Proportion of Mechanical and Content Variables Entering Overall Stepwise Regression To Predict Readership | 114 |
| 16 | R Sq. (Adj) of Component Variables Entering Separate Stepwise Regressions to Predict Readership | 117 |
| 17 | Pearson Correlation Coefficients For Estimated and Observed Readership Measures | 122 |

| TABLE | DESCRIPTION | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Communication Variables and Readership | 123 |
| 19 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Illustration Variables and Readership | 130 |
| 20 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Destination Name Variables and Readership | 139 |
| 21 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Signature Variables and Readership | 141 |
| 22 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Headline Variables and Readership | 149 |
| 23 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Text Variables and Readership | 154 |
| 24 | Frequency and Direction of Significant Relationships Between Individual Call-To-Action Variables and Readership | 164 |

# I. INTRODUCTION

## PREAMBLE

The economic spotlight is increasingly falling on tourism in small towns, cities, resorts, provinces/states and countries throughout the world. Alberta is no exception. Premier Don Getty views tourism as the "third leg" of the economy and the Alberta Government is aiming to increase direct revenues from $2.3 billion in 1986 to $10 billion by the turn of the century (Edmonton Journal, 1986).

It has been speculated that the unexpected strength in the Alberta economy in the face of major problems in the oil patch in 1986 may be due to the impact tourism has on the province. This is particularly visible in such sectors as retail sales. Other sectors benefit too, but do so indirectly and less obviously. The National Task Force on Tourism Data (1986) recommended that tourism, which has historically been measured through demand side surveys, be measured from the supply side in common with other industries. Statistics Canada is working on a feasible method of doing this, as well as on a satellite account for tourism. Initial indications are that the numbers attributed to tourism will rise dramatically with this new approach.

## THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The Alberta Government's position on tourism marketing has for some time been to focus primarily on markets outside the province, both existing and new or developing. The emphasis on external markets is based on their ability to bring new money into the province, and on the private sector's capabilities in marketing to the local population.

Alberta Tourism thus carries much of the risk and financial burden of expanding the market and/or assists tourism facility operators in doing so.

Among non-resident markets, the U.S. is regarded as a key producer. In 1985, 867,000 American visitors accounted for 6% of all visitors staying one or more nights and $233 million, or 11%, of Alberta's total tourism revenues.

Approximately half of Alberta Tourism's 1986/87 budget for advertising was spent in the U.S. and half of that again was in magazine advertising. Competition is intense and growing. U.S. domestic and foreign destination advertising dollars grew 92% between 1982 and 1986 (Ogilvy and

Mather 1987) with domestic advertising growing at a significantly faster pace. Some 33% of the U.S. $180 million spent in 1986 was placed in magazines. To maximize the impact and effectiveness of Alberta's advertising dollars, information is needed on what makes a foreign destination advertisement successful in the U.S. market.

To date, such a specific configuration of information has only been available through ad hoc research projects, generally conducted to pre-test or post-test a particular ad campaign.

The opportunity to carry out a more broadly based analysis of foreign destination advertisements placed in U.S. magazines is offered by use of the Starch INRA Hooper Ad-File. The company maintains a library of tear sheets which include all advertisements, half a page or larger, tested since 1932 in Starch Readership Studies. Ad-File will provide, for a limited period, Starch tested advertisements selected according to any combination of criteria.

Approximately 500 Starch tested tourism destination advertisements placed in U.S. magazines by countries,

provinces or states between 1980 and 1985 were rented by Alberta Tourism. For comparison purposes, two-thirds of the ads selected were for foreign destinations and one-third for domestic (U.S. Continental and Island) destinations.

The information provided in a Starch tested advertisement indicates what percentage of the issue audience recognize having seen: the advertisement in that issue (Noted Score), an illustration in the ad (Seen), the name of the sponsor somewhere in the ad (Associated) and the logo/ signature (Signature). It also shows what percent claim to have Read Some or Read Most of the text. Other scores which may or may not be reported include readership of the headline, subheading/text heading, themeline, caption, coupon or written directive on where to obtain further information.

## PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to provide information which will be of assistance to creative personnel in developing more effective tourism destination ads for the U.S. market. Specific research objectives identified were as follows:

(i) to define mechanical and content variables, including those dealing with subject matter, which describe tourism destination ads;

(ii) to determine which mechanical and content variables contribute to the overall effectiveness of tourism destination advertisements in:

- capturing an audience;
- ensuring that the destination's name is noticed;
- encouraging readership.

(iii) to examine which mechanical and/or content variables increase exposure to different

components of the tourism destination advertisement. These components are:

- illustration;
- destination name;
- text;
- headline;
- subheading;
- themeline;
- captions;
- directives;
- coupon.

OUTLINE

The research undertaken to meet the objectives detailed in the previous section is described in this document.

A review of published literature on Starch Scores, with emphasis on those studies and findings which were incorporated into the present research design, is presented in Chapter II.

Methodology is detailed in Chapter III. This chapter covers both the methodology used in Starch Readership Studies and the method of analysing the advertisements and the associated Starch Scores used in this research.

Results of the analysis are reported in Chapters IV and V. The communication, mechanical and content variables defined for the study are described in Chapter IV. Chapter V deals with the combination of variables found to best predict three levels of Readership and the variables which contribute toward increased exposure to different components of the ad. An assessment of the additional contribution which can be made by including product-specific message variables when predicting Readership measures is made. A discussion of the results accompanies the data.

Finally, in Chapter VI the practical and theoretical implications of the findings are presented and recommendations are made pertaining to the design of foreign tourism destination advertisements to be placed in the U.S. market.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### EARLY HISTORY

Research into advertising started within the discipline of psychology at the turn of the century. Walter Dill Scott was the first to examine the impressions made by advertisements ("The Theory of Advertising" 1903, "The Psychology of Advertising" 1908, reported in Starch 1966). Edward K. Strong, who like Scott used students as experimental subjects, followed with the publication of "The Relative Merit of Advertisements" in 1912 and later began to develop systematic procedures for measuring readership of print advertisements (Starch 1966, Finn 1985).

Daniel Starch outlined his Starch Recognition Procedure in "The Principles of Advertising" published in 1923. George H. Gallup followed with a different variation to measure the recognition of editorial and advertising content of newspapers and introduced this commercially soon after. Starch founded the present service in 1932 (Starch 1966).

## CONTROVERSY OVER THE USE OF RECOGNITION MEASURES

Readership studies based on recognition procedures have not changed in any material way since those pioneering days. Nevertheless the procedure has not been without its detractors and critics.

Zinkhan (1982) described advertising recognition as the least rigorous of six alternative measures of advertising effectiveness ranked as follows:

(i) advertisement recognition;
(ii) aided recall;
(iii) unaided recall;
(iv) attitude to product;
(v) behavioural intention;
(vi) behaviour.

The primary limitation of recognition procedures is that they are measures of audience size only, rather than measures of any further effects a particular ad may have on attitude change or behaviour (Twedt 1952). Starch (1966) contended that while the ultimate measure of effectiveness is indeed the buying action, this can only occur if the advertisement is perceived by the buyer in the first place.

He also presented evidence in his book that advertised brands of infrequently purchased products (cars, fridges, washers, dryers, insurance) were more likely to be known, acceptable (that is, a brand the reader would buy), owned and recently purchased by the readers of the ad than by non-readers who were also exposed to the issue containing the ad or an issue without the ad. The range in magnitude of the differences was as follows:

| | Readers Exceed Non-Readers By: |
|---|---|
| Awareness | 0% - +15% |
| Acceptance | +23% - +47% |
| Ownership/Use | +23% - +74% |
| Purchase Rate | +68% - +112% |

The increase in recent purchase (Zinkhan's highest level of effectiveness) showed the greatest difference between readers and non-readers. This interpretation assumes causality, but reinforcement readership may well come into play at the two higher levels.

Starch also looked at the purchase rates for frequently purchased non-durable products such as food, toilet soap, beer and gas. Reinforcement ad readership is less likely

to take place for such products. The results showed that readers of an advertisement were 44% more likely to have purchased that brand during the week following distribution of the issue than were non-readers of the ad. Purchase rates were also higher than in the week following an issue without such an ad.

Critics of the recognition method gathered ammunition to demonstrate that the readership levels produced were inflated. Such studies involved the use of bogus advertisements placed in a magazine (Lucas 1963) or real advertisements which did not originally appear in that issue of the magazine (Simmons 1961) or different versions of an advertisement placed in a portfolio in a pre/post-test situation (Marder and David 1961).

Claimed over-representation ranged from 5% to 50% and up and was hypothesized to occur for an almost unlimited variety of reasons.

Other studies place the overclaiming factor at approximately 5% (Starch 1966, Zielski 1982) when "proven recognition" was first established or when the respondents were alerted that some material might be new.

Attempts were made to derive confusion control formulae to adjust the recognition scores (Moran 1951, Lucas 1963) but were fraught with problems and are not in widespread use. However, the problem is still of interest to researchers. Most recently Singh and Cole (1985) and Leigh and Menon (1986) tried to find correction formulae for guessing.

It is also notable that an Advertising Research Foundation Study conducted to test print advertising rating methods, and specifically the Starch method, found little to criticize in the way the studies were conducted (Lucas 1963, Starch Tested Copy Vol. 1, No. 1). Starch (1966) further reported that eye camera measures of length of focus correlated strongly with Read Most Scores (0.95) and less so but positively for Seen-Associated Scores (0.68). Since depth and permanence of impression are directly related to length of exposure, this provides external validity for the technique, if not for the actual scoring levels themselves.

A recent study of 96 advertising agencies (Russell and Martin 1980) found two-thirds use the Starch INRA Hooper Ad Readership Service and rated it as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Extremely useful | - 16% |
| Very useful | - 26% |
| Moderately useful | - 31% |
| Of little use | - 16% |
| Of no value | - 11% |

Thus, despite the debates which raged in the 1950's and 1960's, in practical terms recognition methods still have a role to play in assessing advertising effectiveness.

The fallout from the controversy is visible among those who publish studies using recognition scores in the academic literature. Many authors feel the need to justify their choice of material. Valiente (1973) stated: "Although the recognition method used by Starch has some inherent weaknesses (Lucas 1950), the method is nevertheless widely used by advertising practitioners." Holbrook and Lehmann stated (1980): "... the continued use of readership measures attests to a faith among advertising researchers that if widely recognized advertisements do not necessarily achieve success (due to a variety of other factors), the promptly forgotten ads can be counted on to fail" (emphasis mine).

Following Krugman's line of thinking (1966, 1977) Rossiter (1981) pointed out that although high involvement decisions require a recall awareness response and low involvement decisions a recognition response, "Unfortunately, convention as well as measurement convenience have dictated reliance on recognition measures for print ads and recall measures for broadcast ads, regardless of consumer decision process considerations."

Krugman (1977, 1986) hypothesized that recognition measures non-verbal non-recallable memories which reside in the right hemisphere of the brain. It would include ads screened out from further left brain processing, i.e. that elicit minimal attention and cannot be recalled. Furthermore, recognition seems to measure a kind of memory that involves no forgetting.

If this is true, it provides additional support for Starch's contention (1966) that "The recognition method undoubtedly comes the closest to measuring the total number of readers of an advertisement. Recall methods, particularly unaided recall procedures, do not uncover all advertisements originally seen or read by a particular reader" (emphasis mine).

## ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS TESTING USING RECOGNITION SCORES

Pollay (1985), in his analysis of print advertisements through the first eight decades of the century pointed to the 1950's as the start of a new trend which he dubbed 'the subsiding sizzle'. Discussion of results using recognition scores will focus on this period.

The post-war era of research into Readership Scores started with Twedt's (1952) use of mathematically based analytical techniques (factor and multiple regression analysis) to isolate elements of an advertisement which contribute to increased exposure to that advertisement. This is in contrast to the approach used by Starch (1966, Starch Tested Copy) which concentrates on the use of indices and percentages and the contrasting of high and low scoring advertisements.

Research published in academic literature has generally followed the model set by Twedt. The researcher isolates elements of an advertisement which have previously been examined by other researchers, which are easy to code and/or which he/she believes may contribute to effectiveness. These are then coded and entered into a

multiple regression analysis using Readership Scores as the dependent variables.

While some researchers have used factor analysis first (eg. Holbrook and Lehmann 1980, Valiente 1983), most have not (eg. Diamond 1968, Fletcher and Winn 1974, Rossiter 1981).

Soley and Reid (1983a) used one-way analysis of variance when examining the effects of one element and introduced a refinement by using Logit transformation of Readership Scores. Logit transformation was also applied by Finn (1985). A few studies have used other methods (eg. Assael, Kofron and Burgi, 1967 used AID; Hanssens and Weitz 1980, used an analysis of co-variance).

Sample sizes below 200 have frequently been reported (eg. Twedt 1952, Fletcher and Zeigler 1978, Holbrook and Lehmann 1980, Rossiter 1981, Soley and Reid 1983b) which gives rise to concern about the establishment of spurious relationships in the studies.

Many of these studies have involved the use of industrial, business or consumer magazines with a bias toward male readers (Twedt 1952, Assael, Kofron and Burgi 1967, Hanssens and Weitz 1980, Holbrook and Lehmann 1980, Rossiter 1981, Soley and Reid 1983a and 1983b).

## PREVIOUS RESEARCH FINDINGS

### GENERAL

Results of the studies examined show that from one to two-thirds of the variance in Noting and Association Scores could be accounted for by the researcher identified elements, with most studies coming in around 40%. A somewhat lower proportion of variance was accounted for in the Read Most Scores, ranging from one to two-fifths, most falling in the low 30% range.

### SEX AND PRODUCT CLASS

Only one study included sex of the reader as a variable and found significant differences in the scores (Diamond 1968). Such differences do not reflect differences by sex per se, but reflect differences in interest levels in different product classes.

Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 2, No. 21) presented results of two surveys: a 1983 study conducted in over 4,500 U.S. homes covering 18 principal interests; and a 1981/82 study covering Associated Scores for over 7,500 one-page four colour ads in 14 magazines, classified into 20 product

categories. The results are shown below in rank order for ease of comparison. The only categories listed are those where comparable items were involved in the two studies. Where different labels were used, interests are shown first and readership labels in parenthesis.

TABLE 1: RANK ORDER OF INTERESTS AND ADVERTISEMENT READERSHIP

| | Males | | Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interest | Readership | Interest | Readership |
| Business and Finance | 1 | 10 | 13 | 12 |
| Sports (Sporting Goods) | 2 | 7 | 16 | 11 |
| Automobiles | 3 | 2 | 17 | 19 |
| Travel and Vacation | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
| TV/Movies/Music (Entertainment) | 9 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| Books | 11 | 14 | 10 | 17 |
| Fashions and Clothes | 14 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Food (Food Preparation) | 15 | 13 | 2 | 2 |
| Home Furnishings | 16 | 20 | 4 | 10 |
| Homemaking (Household Supplies) | 18 | 19 | 8 | 8 |

Adapted from Starch Tested Copy, Vol. 2, No. 21.

The above results display higher correspondence between interest and readership within sex than between sexes. Interest in and readership of automobile ads was particularly strong among males and food, home furnishing and homemaking related ads considerably stronger among females. For certain subject areas, however, there was a strong correspondence in readership of ads as measured both by rank and by indexes (not shown here), even where interest levels showed major differences; that is, business and finance, sports, fashion and clothes. Of the ten interest areas compared, only three showed close agreement between the sexes and all related to leisure activities, viz. travel and vacation, entertainment and books.

In a sense, those researchers who used industrial magazines have automatically controlled for such differences as one can expect a high level of homogeneity among such readers. In using a consumer magazine, Copland (see Hendon 1973) found product groups the fourth most important variable after size, colour and position in magazine. Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) used consumer magazines and incorporated product class variables among their elements for analysis. They, too, found that product class contributed substantially to Readership

Scores and in particular to the less predictable Read Most Score.

Fletcher and Winn (1974) had followed earlier recommendations by Starch to exercise product group control and used only food ads in their study. Like Holbrook and Lehmann, they were able to account for an unusually high proportion of variance in Read Most Scores and concluded that the use of a single product class allows for greater generalization for the product and enables the inclusion of relevant product class variables such as a recipe for a food ad.

The lack of control for product class by other academic researchers is probably a result of having limited access to scored ads (which are generally sold commercially) and the desire to produce generalized principles for effective advertising. This precludes the inclusion of numerous "creative" variables dealing with subject matter which might increase predictive power. It results in a focus on common mechanical and content variables.

## MECHANICAL VS. CONTENT VARIABLES

Ever since Twedt (1952) concluded that three mechanical variables -- advertisement size, number of colours and

square inches of illustration -- could account for 76% of the variance in total audience for an advertisement, advertising people have reacted strongly against the apparent negating of the value of the message or "creative content".

Valiente (1973), in essentially repeating Twedt's study using business and consumer magazines, also found that the size of the ad and number of colours accounted for the majority of variance in Noting Scores. However, both considered certain characteristics to be content which later researchers classified as mechanical. Few from their list would today be regarded as content variables.

Other researchers whose results pointed to mechanical variables -- and particularly ad size, colour and size of illustration -- as the most important determinants of readership include Rudolph (1947), Yamanaka (1962), Troldahl and Jones (1965) and Assael, Kofron and Burgi (1967) reported in Valiente (1973). Hendon (1973) in reporting on Marplan studies carried out during the 1950's where product category, page size and colour were held constant, also found significant predictors of Noting Scores were mechanical, eg. space devoted to illustration,

headline, text and signature; position of illustration in ad and execution.

Flying in the face of these findings is the study conducted by Holbrook and Lehmann (1980). They classified anything with a number as mechanical, anything based on creative approach (source of message, appeal used, claims made) as message-content variables and found that the latter group performed better than the former in predicting readership at all levels. However, Rossiter (1981) using one issue of a consumer magazine, obtained similar predictive results for Noted and Associated (but not Read Most) Scores using a parsimonious set of 13 mechanical visual and psycholinguistic predictor variables. Soley and Reid (1983b) duplicated this study using industrial magazines with much the same overall result; but the specific predictor variables which entered the regression equation were more consistent with findings of other researchers than with Rossiter!

Finn (1985) in his overview of previous research, isolated those variables that have consistently or close to consistently been found to be significantly related to readership. This list includes: ad size, front of magazine, cover position, right page, adjacent to other

ads, four colours, larger illustration size, use of photos and bleed, personal references and number of adjectives in the headline, and less copy.

Over time, some of these findings appear to have borne fruit (assuming causality rather than fashion). Pollay (1985), in his investigation of trends in magazine advertisements, showed the following data in the post-war period:

TABLE 2: CHANGES IN MAGAZINE ADVERTISING

| | 1950's % | 1960's % | 1970's % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Size of Ad | | | |
| More than 1 page | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| Full page | 54 | 57 | 54 |
| Less than 1 page | 41 | 32 | 30 |
| Artwork | | | |
| Photographic | 62 | 77 | 82 |
| Other | 38 | 23 | 18 |
| Artwork Space | | | |
| More than 50% | 73 | 72 | 63 |
| Less than 50% | 26 | 26 | 34 |
| Typographical | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Copy Volume Index * | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 |

*Indexed against the average amount of copy over all eight decades = 1.0

Adapted from Pollay, 1985.

He further stated that colour was used in more than 75% of the 1970's ads, up from just below 50% in the 1940's.

Findings of an experimental study conducted by Hornik (1980) in constructing a model where the dependent variable was preference rather than readership would suggest either advertisers and their agencies would like to read more into audience Readership Scores than is really there, or researchers have not been including the most relevant variables in their studies.

Hornik isolated three meaningful dimensions to predict preference for carpets. The most significant included content variables dealing with perceived benefits (eg. price or perceived expensiveness, beauty, special offers). Next were some mechanical variables which contributed to attention-getting properties of the ad and created an immediate impression, viz. colour, illustration size, position of the product in the advertisement. The third dimension, which did not make a significant contribution to preference, included other mechanical variables such as number of elements in the illustration and the quality of the photo.

It is obvious that the types of variables which have thus far been found to contribute to readership correspond with Hornik's second dimension. Yet the first dimension was the most important and the variables contributing to this

deal with the subject matter or information provided by the ad -- an area generally avoided in the studies discussed previously!

Fletcher and Zeigler (1978) attempted to go one step further and measured the relationship between creative strategy and advertisement readership. They applied Julian L. Simon's ten category creative strategy typology and classified 50 one page four colour food advertisements read by females accordingly. The results were not statistically significant but higher scoring ads were found to use information and symbolic associations more often.

## THE ROLE AND STUDY OF INFORMATION IN ADVERTISING

There has been a long-standing debate over the function of advertising -- whether its primary objective is to provide information on which consumers can act or to persuade consumers to act.

In a study of the economic effects of advertising covering 16 consumer product classes in 25 European markets over ten years, Lambin (1975) posed the question of whether consumers perceive real or apparent differences among

brands and develop preferences as a result of advertising. His conclusion was that there is a modest effect, but that consumers are less responsive to non-informative advertising. He further concluded, "Advertising in general has limited capacity to stimulate total market growth, and purely persuasive advertising is even less effective. Advertising is powerful when it accompanies more objective tasks, and the content of the advertising is more important than the total amount spent on it."

In their classic study of how Americans view advertising, Bauer and Greyser (see Soley and Reid 1983c) found 57% approved it for being informative. The rate differed by medium with the most informative being newspaper (59%) followed by magazine (48%), radio (40%) and television (31%). Soley and Reid verified this relationship using a satisfaction scale scored 0 to 6, with magazines averaging 3.6 and television 3.05.

Two studies reported by Resnik and Stern (1977) and Stern, Krugman and Resnik (1981) demonstrated this perception of informativeness was based on reality. Among television ads studied, 49% were categorized as containing at least one informational cue, while 86% of magazine ads were considered informative by the same criterion. The authors

also demonstrated that this proportion varies by product group, but not by advertisement size. Pollay's (1985) longitudinal analysis showed a decline in the average number of copy points measured on his information scales, from 4.0 in the 1950's to 3.7 in the 1960's and 3.8 in the 1970's, despite the increase in size of the ads over this period.

In conducting proprietary qualitative research, Alberta Tourism has repeatedly found that consumers want information from advertising, that they do not want to read lots of copy, and that the information should be of such a nature that it can be used to persuade other travel party members to consider the destination. The discussions have also shown that illustration material is in itself considered to be informative. It is not clear in the studies discussed above how the contribution of the illustrations was evaluated within the context of the assessment of "information content".

In addition, there are real problems in deciding what "information" is. Resnik and Stern (1977) developed a classification system incorporating 14 criteria "which represented all potential categories of information potentially useful to the consumer" (Stern, Krugman and

Resnik 1981). Many of these categories are irrelevant for a wide variety of goods (eg. nutrition, taste), while others, which might be relevant for only a few specific product groups, are omitted or would be considered to fall into a more general category. For example, would information on the history of a tourism destination be considered "components or contents"?

Parker (1981), in providing guidelines for print effectiveness, indicated that copy should "work harder at providing information" which would answer the questions of how, what, where, why and when. Simons's creative strategy classification (Fletcher and Zeigler 1978) defined information as, "The presentation of unadorned facts, without explanation or argument; just 'news about' the product concerned." Krugman (1975) distinguished carefully between such information (that is, where information equals news) and "rational stimulus" which he felt is the ingredient that causes consumers to evaluate, judge, decide and is related to needs and wants (similar to Simon's "argument category"). He felt this is especially important for more expensive products.

Using a similar line of thought, Hanssens and Weitz (1980) speculated that the main function of advertisements for

products in the early stages of their life cycle and for complex products (presumably expensive and/or requiring high involvement) is to provide information. Their study revealed no such link, leading to the conclusion that more exploration of information content, organization and readability is needed.

Fletcher and Winn (1974), however, found Associated and Read Most Scores were significantly increased by the number of product facts or benefits and the presence of a recipe in food ads -- presumably a product group which is not complex, not expensive and low involvement!

There is no question that this entire area requires further investigation if research is to be of practical use in creative design.

## THEORY OF INFORMATION PROCESSING

Finn (1985) pointed out that despite the number of studies using recognition scores, many questions still remain unanswered and conflicting findings are explained away in an ad hoc manner. He stressed the need to move from exploratory research to research based on theory in which

directional relationships can be specified a priori, thus avoiding the assumption of causality.

Using an information processing paradigm, which has dominated consumer research, two alternative models were proposed and tested. The Divergent Processing Effectiveness Model provided a better fit to recognition print ad effectiveness data than the Hierarchical Effectiveness Model.

The Divergent Processing Effectiveness Model, like the Hierarchical Model, accepts that after exposure pictorial material will be processed first. As there are no recognition measures for exposure, this level is omitted from the model. The first level is labelled Attention and would be expected to be determined by the characteristics of the advertisement's overall layout and main pictorial elements. Measurement of Attention is through Noting and Seen Illustration Scores. The other two process types are labelled Denotive Association and Verbal Elaboration and in the Divergent Model these could take place in any order or not at all. Denotive Association includes advertisement characteristics such as the headline and signature and smaller pictorial elements. Measurement of Denotive Association is through Associated and Signature

Scores. Verbal Elaboration includes copy characteristics and is measured by Read Some and Read Most Scores.

This support for a Divergent Processing Model should be a surprise to advertising professionals who feel that a reader first looks at the illustration, then the headline and finally the copy. Dunn and Barban (1974), for example, state that one function of a headline is to lure readers into the text. Yet other research has generally indicated that the headline does not enhance advertisements. Soley and Reid's (1983a) investigation of the impact of the headline on readership yielded a non-significant relationship between the type of headline and Readership Scores at all levels (noticed, started to read, read half or more).

One of the implications of this model is that measures of Attention will be more closely tied to measures of Association and Elaboration than the latter two would be to each other. However, [1]Finn's correlation coefficients do not show such a clear distinction:

| | Noted | Associated | Signature |
|---|---|---|---|
| Associated | .957 | - | - |
| Signature | .945 | - | - |
| Read Some | .702 | .689 | .684 |
| Read Most | .611 | .612 | .608 |

Adapted from Finn, 1985.

Finn is not the first to have noted the high correlation between the different levels of readership. Rossiter (1981) commented on the .87 correlation he obtained between Noting and Association. More recently, Zinkhan and Gelb (1986) obtained a .83 correlation between Noting and Association. However, contrary to theoretical prediction, the Noted-Read Most correlation was .49 and Associated-Read Most, .51.

Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 2, No. 16) reported "... the more observers an advertisement attracts, the more readers it will convert, on average, to thorough readers ... as Noted and Associated Scores go up, the Read Most Scores go up at about the same rate." Aside from Finn (1985), no other published work has reflected any attempt to control for this relationship. Thus, published studies effectively only describe those components of an ad that affect Attention.

## III. METHODOLOGY

### THE STARCH READERSHIP SERVICE

The Starch Readership Service provides information on the proportion of readers of an issue who saw an ad in that issue.

### THE OBJECTIVE OF STARCH READERSHIP STUDIES

"A basic part of advertising's scheme of operation depends upon reaching masses of people. It is this fundamental element mass exposure that the Starch Readership Studies are measuring. The plain and simple purpose of a readership survey is to obtain a measurement of the first objective of any advertisement, i.e., to be seen and read. Obviously, only those people who see or read your advertisement can be directly influenced by it." (Starch Tested Copy, Vol. 1, No. 1).

### METHODOLOGY

#### Sample Size and Selection

To meet the above objective, Starch have found, and the Advertising Research Foundation Study of Print Advertising

Rating Methods affirmed, that the recognition technique using quota sampling and moderate size samples gives reliable and valuable readership information.

Personal face-to-face interviews are conducted with adults 18 years and older, usually 100 with males and/or 100 with females.

For consumer publications, interviews are generally carried out in readers' homes in 20 to 30 urban locations which are selected for each study issue to parallel geographic circulation. Interviews are distributed by age, income level and occupation so that each study is broadly representative of the publication's audience.

Publications with small circulations are studied using subscriber lists and are not controlled by sex. For business publications interviews are also not controlled by sex but are designed to parallel circulation by field of industry and job responsibility. Such interviews are generally conducted in offices or places of business.

Interviews are conducted early in the life of a publication. For weekly or bi-weekly magazines interviewing begins three to six days after the on sale date and continues for one to two weeks. For monthly magazines

interviewing begins two weeks after the on sale date and continues for three weeks. Only people who had glanced through or read some part of the issue prior to the interviewer's visit are interviewed. This is established by having the respondent look at the cover, table of contents, or glance through the publication.

## Interviewing Procedure

With the publication open, the respondent is asked for each advertisement being studied, "Did you see or read any part of this advertisement?" If "Yes", questions follow to determine the observation and reading of each component part of the ad (illustration, headline, signature, copy blocks).

Up to 90 items are covered during an interview and starting points for the interview are rotated through the magazine to control for the effects of fatigue.

## Results

The results for each ad are shown on labels attached to the relevant component. Three Starch readership levels are reported for the "Ad-As-A-Whole" as follows:

Noted: Percentage of respondents who saw any part of the advertisement, i.e. the proportion of the issue audience. It is only within this portion of the audience that the message can exercise its influence.

Associated: Percentage of respondents who saw or read anywhere in the advertisement the name of the product/service being advertised. This measures those who look at an advertisement long enough to learn what is being advertised.

Read Most: Percentage of respondents who read half or more of the written material in the ad.

The components of the advertisement carry the following labels:

Seen: Percentage of respondents who saw the illustration.

Read: Percentage of respondents who read the headline, subheading, themeline, coupon or "for further information" directive.

Read Some: Percentage of respondents who read some or all of the body copy.

Signature: Percentage of respondents who saw the logo or signature (located in the coupon, where applicable).

The tear sheet also has a sticker showing the name of the publication and date of the issue, the page number on which the ad appeared and the number of ads in the issue.

## METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENTS

### SELECTION OF ADVERTISEMENTS TO BE STUDIED

The Starch Ad-File Service was asked to select as wide a variety of tourism destination advertisements as possible within the following constraints:

- All ads should be sponsored by countries, states or provinces to ensure that the sample of ads compete directly with Alberta for attention and that there would, presumably, be some commonality of objectives. Ads placed by resorts, cities or other regional tourism destinations, by the travel trade, or by individual industry operators such as hotels, attractions and transportation carriers were excluded. However, if a country, province/state advertised co-operatively with any of the above (i.e. both signatures shown), the ad was included in the sample.

- All ads should be for pleasure travel purposes. Those dealing with conventions or to stimulate financial investment were excluded.

- A total of approximately 500 recently published advertisements should be selected.

- Approximately 175 ads should be for U.S. destinations including Alaska, Hawaii and U.S. offshore territories, 100 for Canada and Canadian provinces and 225 for other foreign countries; in general terms, one-third of the ads would be for U.S. domestic and two-thirds for foreign destinations.

SAMPLE SIZE OBTAINED

A total of 504 ads was used in the analysis. Since some had been Starch tested both among male and female readers, this delivered an effective reading of 567.

Although all ads were coded and used for a limited number of general analyses, the bulk of the research findings are confined to one page four colour (1P4) ads. This decision was influenced by recommendations made in the published literature (eg. Finn 1985) and by Starch INRA Hooper to control for the overwhelming influence of ad size and colour when wishing to further examine variables influencing readership. Since the bases for analysis of

other formats were small (eg. two page four colour spreads, the next largest group, contained only 47 readings), these were not examined separately.

The distribution obtained by region and sex for both the total sample and the sample of 1P4 ads is shown below:

TABLE 3: SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION

| | Total Sample | | 1P4 Ads | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Ads | # of Readings | # of Ads | # of Readings |
| Region | | | | |
| U.S. Domestic | 170 | 191 | 121 | 134 |
| Canada | 131 | 147 | 97 | 107 |
| Other Foreign | 203 | 229 | 165 | 185 |
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 43 | 106 | 35 | 78 |
| Female | 330 | 393 | 240 | 283 |
| Both | 63 | n/a | 43 | n/a |
| Not Specified | 68 | 68 | 65 | 65 |
| Total: | 504 | 567 | 383 | 426 |

n/a - not applicable

All the advertisements had been published between 1980 and mid-1985 at the rate of approximately 100 per year and were drawn from a selection of 33 different magazines. These included travel, business, general interest, women's, outdoor, black and home magazines. However, 45% of the advertisements had been published in Sunset

Magazine. Each of the other magazines represented fewer than 10% of the sampled ads.

Twenty-one different ad formats were obtained, ranging from a half page black and white ad to an eight page four colour gatefold. Twenty-three were less than one page in size, 448 one page, 16 one and one-third pages, 68 two pages and two more than two pages. Almost all were four colour ads; only 19 were in black and white -- and these were frequently purely typographical -- and only one was a two colour ad.

## CODING OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

There were two levels of coding required for each advertisement reading. Firstly, the Starch Scores and other labelled information on the tear sheet were recorded. Then mechanical and content variables were identified and their presence/absence or measurements coded.

### Starch Readership Study Information

All the information obtained as a result of conducting a Starch Readership Study was coded, including that relevant to the publication.

The Starch Scores coded were the overall readership measures of Noted, Associated and Read Most and the component measures of Seen, Read Some and Signature which were reported on all tear sheets. The remaining Readership Scores were not present in all ads, nor were they provided consistently from one ad to another.

It was thus necessary to interpret which component had been measured -- not always an easy task, particularly for the headline. Guiding rules were set to cover readership measurements for each component which was distinguished from the main body of text by having larger or bolder type, and usually set apart from the text itself.

(a) Headline, Subheading/Text Heading, Themeline:

(i) If the line with the largest type says something other than the destination name alone, it is considered the headline; if there is a second smaller line this is considered a subheading/text heading.

(ii) If the line with the largest type is the destination name only and there is another distinctive line with smaller type, the smaller type line is

considered the headline; if there is no smaller type line the name alone is the headline.

(iii) If the headline so distinguished is in fact a themeline/slogan used for the destination or in more than one ad in a campaign, it is coded both as a headline and a themeline.

(iv) If the headline distinguished in (ii) had a sticker identifiying it as the Signature, it was coded both as the headline and as the Starch Identified Signature.

(v) If the themeline had a sticker identifying it as the Signature, it was coded both as the themeline and as the Starch Identified Signature.

(b) Captions, Directives and Coupons:

Other "Read" stickers were somewhat less confusing. Those attached to captions to photos were coded as the Caption Readership Score. Those attached to directives set apart from or placed at the end of the main body of text, (normally in the form of an address to which one could

write for further information or a telephone/800 number to call) were coded as Directive Readership Scores.

Coupons also represent a call-to-action and their Readership Scores were coded in two ways. Where the Starch Identified Signature was in the coupon (as part of the name/address, or as a logo within the coupon) this was considered a Coupon Signature as distinct from all other signature positions which were coded as Signature Elsewhere.

If the sticker attached to the coupon was not the Starch Identified Signature, it was coded as the Coupon Readership Score. Coupon Signature Readership was not considered analogous to Coupon Readership.

(c) Signature and Main Identifier:

It will be obvious from the discussion above that the placement of the Signature label by the Starch Readership Service is far from consistent. This problem appears to be exacerbated in tourism destination advertisements since many destinations do not have the logo typical of consumer goods. Thus, not only can the Starch Identified Signature appear anywhere in the ad, but different ads from the same

campaign Starched in different magazines at different times are identified by the Starch Readership Service as having the signature in different places.

Even worse, from the perspective of reliable measurement, is that in a handful of such comparable ads, where a general "Read" sticker was attached to a component in one ad and a "Signature" sticker was attached to the same component in another ad, the scores were dramatically different (Noting Scores being similar and not the influencing factor). The direction of the difference was invariably for the Signature sticker to have the higher numbers.

Because of these problems it was decided to code the Starch Identified Signature as one category no matter where it was drawn from and to add a new category for readership of the "Main Identifier". This involved distinguishing that part of the ad in which the name of the destination appeared most prominently. Obviously, a subjective assessment was necessary since the name in large type in the headline might or might not be considered more prominent than the name appearing in the coupon. The score recorded for this new category was

whatever Readership Score appeared there, no matter what the label. Ninety percent of the ads could be scored in this way.

## Mechanical and Content Descriptors of the Ad

In order to derive a comprehensive list of the contents of a tourism destination ad, two searches were undertaken. The first involved examination of the variables already applied in the published literature and/or which had been discussed in Starch Tested Copy. The second involved a content analysis of the ads themselves.

### (a) Literature Search

Variables which had been identified in previous research as significant, or where different research had different results, were included in the study to provide a measure of replication.

In setting up the code book, a number of factors were borne in mind throughout:

- In this study only one coder would be used and an attempt was made to avoid items which were too open to subjective judgment or coder error.

- Where there was reason to believe that one method of measuring a variable was superior to another, that method was chosen.

- Where it was felt that a variable might be influential in tourism advertisements, even though previous research results had not been significant, it was included.

- Where a variable had previously been found non-significant, but represented a component frequently used anyway in tourism destination advertisements, it was included.

(b) Content Analysis

A content analysis of the tear sheets was carried out to ensure that a reasonably complete description of the components of the ads and their subject matter would be included as variables. In deciding on which variables to include the number of advertisements containing a

particular variable was not a consideration. However, the potential importance of the variable in the marketing decision concerning the message and/or its potential importance in the production of creative were major considerations.

It was decided to avoid extensive use of categories of message which involved a measure of subjective judgment (eg. believable, attention-getting, creative as used by Holbrook and Lehmann, 1980) and concentrate on the subject matter itself. This luxury is not available when a mixed bag of product class and even product within a class is used in a study.

Each major component of the ad was examined independently, i.e. picture(s), headline, signature, main identifier, text, captions, coupon. For each, a list of both mechanical variables and content variables was set up for coding in an appropriate fashion. Most variables were considered dichotomous (eg. present/absent); some were classified on an ordinal scale showing extent of presence (eg. main/only subject, secondary subject, not present), while those measuring an aspect of size or quantity were usually coded on interval scales.

The variables finally selected, along with the distribution obtained are described in detail in Chapter IV.

## DATA PROCESSING

All processing of data was undertaken using SPSSx Version 2.1. Output was obtained in a variety of different forms, ranging from frequency counts of the raw data to regression analyses. As a number of analyses required the identification of dependent and independent variables, these are discussed first.

### Dependent Variables

All the Starch Scores discussed previously formed the basis for the series of dependent variables developed.

However, with the exception of the Noted Score, raw scores were not used. Finn (1985) emphasized the dependence of the Associated and Read Some Scores on the Noting Score and showed strong positive correlation coefficients between Noting and all other scores measured in his study. He recommended controlling for Noting levels in further research.

Readership Rates which effectively control for initial Attention levels and allow the analysis to focus on the variables which determine real Association and Elaboration were calculated from the raw scores. The formula used to do this was simply:

$$\text{Readership Rate} = \frac{\text{Starch Readership Score}}{\text{Noted Score}} \times 100$$

The resulting rate had a further advantage in being interpretable in itself.

The success of this conversion is clearly seen in Table 4 which follows. It shows correlation coefficients between Starch Scores under the diagonal and between Readership Rates above the diagonal.

The most notable effect of the conversion is the general reduction in the value of the correlation coefficients, particularly against the Noted and Seen Scores. Furthermore, where strong and significant correlation coefficients exist, these make intuitive sense, eg. Associated Readership Rates and Main Identifier and Signature Rates. In other cases where Starch Scores were highly signficantly correlated, the significance is much reduced when dealing with Rates (eg. correlation between signature and text components such as the headline and captions).

TABLE 4: INTERCORRELATION OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES USING SCORES AND RATES

| | Noted | Seen | Assoc. | Main ID | Sig. Total | Sig. Elsewhere | Sig. Coupon | Read Some | Read Most | Headline | Sub-Head | Themeline | Caption | Directive | Coupon |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **READERSHIP RATES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Noted | | -.107 | .095 | .023 | .009 | .011 | -.116 | -.025 | .086 | .147** | -.110 | .118 | -.044 | -.068 | -.078 |
| Seen | .998* | | -.072 | .028 | -.040 | -.054 | .075 | -.025 | -.016 | -.021 | -.040 | .032 | -.070 | -.085 | .167 |
| Assoc. | .907* | .900* | | .713* | .674* | .708* | .542* | .111* | .271* | .510* | .364** | .294*** | .022 | .326*** | .187 |
| Main ID | .827* | .820* | .917* | | .643* | .780* | .255*** | .244* | .220* | .406* | .364*** | .203 | .115 | .197 | .167 |
| Sig. Total | .741* | .780* | .867* | .877* | | --- | --- | .308* | .288* | .128*** | .348*** | .307*** | .147 | .034 | .250*** |
| Sig. Else | .799* | .788* | .898* | .921* | --- | | --- | .315* | .274* | .196* | .319*** | .205 | .179 | -.004 | .251 |
| Sig. Coupon | .748* | .736* | .823* | .676* | --- | --- | | .251*** | .281*** | -.116 | -.088 | .642*** | .506*** | .329 | .336 |
| Read Some | .637* | .640* | .675* | .640* | .632* | .642* | .515* | | .849* | .265* | .440* | .380* | .527* | .583* | .530* |
| Read Most | .595* | .600* | .625* | .594* | .595* | .588* | .567* | .895* | | .223* | .443* | .322** | .536* | .532* | .488* |
| Headline | .821* | .819* | .865* | .806* | .691* | .710* | .596* | .622* | .576* | | .300*** | .052 | .359** | .216 | .230*** |
| Sub-Head | .607* | .590* | .681* | .654* | .687* | .681* | .164 | .649* | .664* | .670* | | .323 | <> | -.252 | .276 |
| Themeline | .380* | .361* | .435* | .406* | .433* | .380* | .667*** | .482* | .462* | .336** | .478 | | .354 | .076 | .908 |
| Caption | .417* | .419* | .384* | .525* | .419* | .357 | .787* | .600* | .678* | .477* | <> | .932 | | <> | .985* |
| Directive | .424* | .437* | .484* | .431** | .228 | .196 | .241 | .584* | .525* | .484* | .115 | -.452 | <> | | <> |
| Coupon | .494* | .499* | .494* | .508* | .495* | .415* | .629* | .600* | .613* | .520* | .246 | .928 | .987* | <> | |

READERSHIP SCORES

Pearson Correlation Coefficients. Two-tailed significance at:

* - .000 level
** - .001 level
*** - .01 level

--- - not applicable
<> - no information

The actual Scores and Readership Rates obtained are listed in Table 5 along with the standard deviation of the means.

TABLE 5: STARCH SCORES AND READERSHIP RATES

| | N of Ads | Score Mean% | Score S.D. | Rate Mean% | Rate S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Noted | 426 | 49.8 | 10.6 | n/a | n/a |
| Seen Picture | 426 | 49.7 | 10.6 | 100.0 | 0.4 |
| Associated | 426 | 41.5 | 10.6 | 83.2 | 10.6 |
| Identifier | 387 | 38.9 | 10.9 | 77.8 | 13.3 |
| Signature-Total | 425 | 37.3 | 10.8 | 74.8 | 14.0 |
| Signature-Elsewhere | 327 | 38.4 | 11.0 | 76.1 | 13.8 |
| Signature-Coupon | 98 | 33.6 | 9.2 | 70.5 | 13.7 |
| Read Some | 396 | 15.2 | 6.3 | 30.6 | 10.2 |
| Read Most | 423 | 12.4 | 6.6 | 24.4 | 10.2 |
| Read Headline | 414 | 33.9 | 10.7 | 67.6 | 13.5 |
| Read Subheading | 53 | 22.3 | 9.8 | 43.1 | 16.1 |
| Read Themeline | 68 | 26.0 | 16.0 | 50.9 | 27.6 |
| Read Caption | 65 | 18.4 | 8.9 | 37.7 | 14.4 |
| Read Directive | 53 | 13.6 | 10.7 | 28.9 | 19.3 |
| Read Coupon | 109 | 12.1 | 5.6 | 25.6 | 10.3 |

n/a Not applicable

Finn (1985) suggested that once a reader has focused attention on the advertisement and processed the pictorial content (i.e. the Attention level), he/she would move on to a level of comprehension which required association with the brand and grasp of the overall message. At this level, secondary elements of the ad would be processed.

However, examination of the correlation coefficients in Table 4 between the Readership Rate for the secondary components and the overall measures, suggests a somewhat different pattern. The headline, as predicted, correlated most closely with the overall Association Rate (which, as defined by Starch, represents seeing the name of the product anywhere in the ad).

The elements of caption, directive and coupon correlate most closely with measures of Elaboration, defined by Starch as readership of the written material in the ad, not including a coupon. The grey area concerns subheading/text headings and the themeline, which, while correlating most strongly and significantly with Elaboration measures, load almost as high on Association.

Since, by definition, presence of the name of the product will load on the Association Rate, wherever the name might

appear, and all other print material (excluding coupons) will load on the Elaboration measures, these results do not imply that Finn's suggestions are incorrect, but that there are definitional constraints to using Starch measures in testing his model.

Further insights on the problem will be discussed in examining the independent variables which help predict each of these Readership Rates.

## Independent Variables

All other variables coded were regarded as independent variables. However, to ensure that the results of the regression analyses were not biased, the variables themselves were screened to ensure that dummy variables were entered correctly and that no one variable was completely enclosed by another. When this was the case, one or other variable was deleted. Thus, for example, all variables describing a coupon would be enclosed by a variable indicating presence of a coupon; the latter was then deleted. In some cases these relationships were not obvious and to avoid the confounding effects of highly interrelated variables, the correlation coefficients

between individual variables were checked. Any pairs with a correlation coefficient of .7 or higher were dealt with by eliminating one or other variable in the pair. Where the coefficient was greater than .5 but less than .7, elimination was carried out only if there was a reason to do so. For example, only a few ads depicted seniors and many were from the same campaign; this gave rise to spurious correlations between seniors and certain layout elements of the ad.

## Data Analysis

Data were analysed in four different ways:

(i) Frequency Counts: An initial frequency count was used to provide an overview of the data and to determine appropriate categories for reporting variables coded on an interval scale. After the decision was made to work primarily with 1P4 ads, the frequency count was repeated for this subset only.

(ii) Tabulations: Using the SPSSx Report procedure, Readership Scores and Readership Rates were described for each variable or set of variables. Descriptors were median, mean,

standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, maximum, minimum, and sample size.

The data were analysed in total, by region (foreign vs. domestic) and sex in a nested sequence.

(iii) T-Tests and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA): The significance of the difference between means was analysed for each independent variable using the appropriate method, i.e. T-Tests were applied to dichotomous variables and One-Way ANOVA's to ordinal variables and interval variables recategorized on an ordinal scale. The means actually tested were for the Noted Score and selected Readership Rates.

Detailed information derived in the tabulations and in the tests of significance of difference between means forms a resource which can be consulted when making very specific marketing and/or creative decisions for a new ad. For example, if it were found

that the type of border around a coupon does not contribute significantly to general readership of the coupon in a multiple regression analysis, nevertheless one type of border may produce significantly higher readership than any other in a T-Test.

(iv) Regression Analysis: A series of multiple linear regression analyses was undertaken using the screened data with selected Readership Scores and Rates as the dependent variables.

To predict Attention, the Noting Score was used as the dependent variable. To predict Association, the Association, Signature[1] and Main Identifier Readership Rates were

---

1. To prevent problems caused by multicollinearity, all regression analyses were conducted using independent variables describing the Main Identifier. The only exception was for the prediction of the Signature Readership Rate where Signature variables were substituted for the Main Identifier. The primary rationale behind this decision was the higher level of correlation between Identifier rates and the overall Association Rates (Table 4). In addition, as coding for the inclusion of the destination name in other elements of the advertisement covered all such mentions and their relative importance, this was expected to give a more sensitive reading on position effect than the arbitrarily selected Starch Designated Signature alone.

selected. For measures of Elaboration, the Read Most and Read Some Readership Rates were designated as dependent variables. Also run as dependent variables in this series were two other advertisement components viz. headline and coupon readership rates.

The multiple linear regression analyses were conducted using pairwise deletion of cases and a stepwise selection method. Criteria for entry and removal were: probability of F to enter, PIN (0.05); probability of F for removal, POUT (0.1); and TOLERANCE (0.01).

The results of these analyses are discussed in Chapter V.

## IV. INDEPENDENT VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Examination of published research reveals a degree of confusion with the labels "mechanical" and "content". To a great extent, the distinction is an artificial one determined by the method of classification. For example, number of product benefits is a mechanical count but reflects the content of benefits. Buzzell (1964) talked about message content-and-presentation as being the "creative" aspects of the advertising process. The convention among academic researchers using recognition data has, by and large, been to regard presentation variables as mechanical.

For purposes of separating out the descriptive variables used in this study, an approach similar to that taken by Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) was followed. Content variables were viewed as those reflecting the actual message being communicated, while mechanical variables included anything quantified and/or which described the presentation of the element. The mechanical/content distinction is made primarily for comparison purposes with other research results since the focus in this study is on identifying any and all variables which will enhance readership of a tourism destination ad at different information processing levels.

As these levels were predicted to align themselves reasonably well with the different components of the ad, and since creative decisions will need to be made for each such component, the variable list was set up by component.

Chapter IV deals with the first objective of the research, viz. to define variables which describe tourism destination advertisements. The variables actually used are listed for each component of the ad and the rationale for those selections discussed. The lists also show the incidence of use of each item, for all ads and for 1P4 ads. Titles or accompanying notations detail the classification of the item as mechanical or content.

## COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

In any communication, three elements are needed: a sender, a recipient, and a medium of communication. Variables representing the sender here are the destination sponsoring the ad and the presence of a co-sponsoring organization or a sub-destination. The recipient is the reader categorized by sex. The medium of communication includes variables pertinent to the magazine and to the overall presentation of the ad.

Table 6 details these items and Appendix A1 lists coding instructions for the communication variables.

TABLE 6: COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| Sender | | |
| REGION: Foreign | 66 | 68 |
| CO-SPONSOR: Present | 19 | 17 |
| SUB-DESTINATION: Present | 8 | 7 |
| Recipient | | |
| READER'S SEX: | | |
| Male | 19 | 18 |
| Female | 69 | 67 |
| Unknown | 12 | 15* |
| Medium | | |
| MAGAZINE: | | |
| Travel | 52 | 50 |
| Outdoor | 6 | 5 |
| General | 12 | 10 |
| Home | 4 | 3 |
| Women's | 10 | 10 |
| Business | 12 | 16* |
| Black | 5 | 6 |
| YEAR OF PUBLICATION: | 1982** | 1982** * |
| MONTH OF PUBLICATION: | | |
| January | 1 | 1* |
| February | 8 | 8* |
| March | 16 | 14* |
| April | 21 | 21* |
| May | 15 | 15* |
| June | 8 | 9* |
| July | 3 | 3* |
| August | 2 | 1* |
| September | 6 | 5* |
| October | 10 | 10* |
| November | 9 | 10* |
| December | 2 | 2* |
| PAGE NUMBER: | 64** | 64** |
| SIDE: Right Hand Side | 64 | 77 |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF ADS IN ISSUE: | 109** | 108** |
| COLOUR OF AD: | 4** * | n/a |
| SHAPE OF AD: Vertical | 82* | n/a |
| SIZE OF AD: | 1* | n/a |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.
** Interval Measure; incidence reflects median.
n/a Not Applicable

Sender: Since it was not known a priori whether Americans would respond differently in terms of overall readership levels to ads for domestic destinations than for foreign ones, the 59 destinations were grouped into these categories.

A subset of the ads studied did not promote the broad country/state/province alone and the effects of focusing on a sub-destination or running co-operative ads with commercial partners could be monitored with the Sub-destination and Co-sponsor variables.

Recipient: The information previously discussed on male and female interest in and readership of ads in the travel and vacation product class suggested that there would be few differences between the sexes. This, however, required confirmation.

Medium: Most published research has been derived from ads tested in only a limited range of magazines. Thus, the type of magazine has infrequently been a variable included as a potential influence on readership. Fletcher and Winn (1974) found that the type of magazine

had a significant impact on Noting Scores for one product type. Lucas (1963) believed that comparisons between publications should not be made. Distorting effects result from less prosperous magazines featuring ads from larger advertisers (with a positive effect on scores); more prosperous magazines feature many unique ads with specialized appeal and have thicker issues resulting in a higher interview burden (both having a negative effect on scores). Following Fletcher and Winn's lead, magazine types rather than individual publications were included in this study, with the 33 titles covered being classified into seven groups.

Information on year and month of publication was coded but not included in the multiple regression analyses. The results, however, will be discussed later in this report.

Three other publication variables, the number of ads in an issue, left or right-hand page position and position in magazine have been studied repeatedly with mixed results. Diamond (1968) found that the more competing ads in an

issue, the lower the readership score. Hanssens and Weitz (1980) found no significant relationship between readership and number of ads before or after the ad being studied. Daniel Starch (1966), in commenting on the effect of the thickness of an issue, gave figures which predicted a 1% decline for every five ads over the 50 to 80 in an average issue at that time. The present research showed far higher numbers of ads per issue since only 25% had 80 ads or fewer.

Position of the ad on the right-hand or left-hand side of the magazine has also been studied with mixed results. Anderson (1960) and Diamond (1968) found some advantage to position on the right-hand side, Fletcher and Winn (1974) to the left-hand side, while Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) and Hanssens and Weitz (1980) and Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 5) reported no significant difference. One problem with many of these studies is the use of multiple ad formats. In the present sample it was found that while most 1P4 ads were placed on the right-hand side, spread ads started on the left-hand side and ads less than

one page in size were more likely to be placed on the left-hand side than 1P4 ads. Thus, the particular mix of sizes could have influenced previous research results.

Position in the magazine has been measured in a number of ways; frequently ads appearing in a cover position are isolated and the remaining ads classified by page number or as appearing in each half, third, quarter or one-sixth of the publication. Generally, the findings have established an advantage for a cover position and higher Readership Scores earlier in the issue (Anderson 1960; Diamond 1968; Holbrook and Lehman 1980; Hanssens and Weitz 1980). Fletcher and Winn (1974) and Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 4) reported significant differences for cover positions but not for different inside positions.

Since the present sample was of tear sheets rather than whole issues of magazines, only page number could be recorded. As there were only three covers included in the sample, they were simply coded as page 0.

## VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ATTENTION

Factors predicted to contribute to Attention (as measured by recognition techniques) centre around pictorial elements of the advertisement.

Mechanical variables are listed in Table 7 and content variables in Table 8. Appendix A2 details coding instructions for pictorial variables.

Bleed:

Mechanical variables selected to examine pictorial material have been extensively used in previous research. The use of bleed has generally been found to give a positive impetus to Readership Scores. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 5) reported an estimated 15% gain for 1P4 ads. Other researchers reporting significant positive effects are Anderson (1960), Assael, Kofron and Burgi (1967), Fletcher and Winn (1974) and Holbrook and Lehmann (1980), although several found marginal or no significant differences (Diamond 1968, Hendon 1973, Hanssens and Weitz 1980, Finn 1985).

TABLE 7: MECHANICAL VARIABLES PERTAINING TO THE ILLUSTRATION

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| MARGIN: Bleed | 62 | 63 |
| EXECUTION: | | |
| Photos - total | 89 | 90* |
| - multiple | 7 | 7 |
| - 2-3 equiweighted | 8 | 7 |
| - 1 main and non-inset(s) | 18 | 17 |
| - 1 main and inset(s) | 17 | 20 |
| - 1 photo | 39 | 40 |
| Mixed - photo and drawing | 7 | 7 |
| Drawing - total | 3 | 3* |
| - 1 drawing | 1 | 1* |
| - multiple | 2 | 2 |
| No illustration | 1 | -- |
| NUMBER OF ILLUSTRATIONS: | 2** | 2** |
| PERCENT OF AD WHICH IS ILLUSTRATION: | 76** | 77** |
| SHAPE OF ILLUSTRATION (excluding full ad): | | |
| Horizontal rectangle | 11 | 8 |
| Vertical rectangle | 23 | 29 |
| Square | 2 | 2 |
| Irregular | 38 | 34 |
| POSITION IN AD: | | |
| Full ad | 25 | 26* |
| Top down | 27 | 28 |
| Bottom up | 6 | 5 |
| Centered | 20 | 24 |
| Left | 6 | 3 |
| Right | 4 | 2 |
| Scattered | 11 | 11 |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| POSITION RELATIVE TO TEXT: | | |
| Above text | 34 | 39 |
| Below text | 7 | 8 |
| Next to text | 25 | 19 |
| Text superimposed | 31 | 31* |
| No illustration/text | 4 | 3* |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.

** Interval measure; incidence reflects median.

Execution: Another significant positive impact is made through the use of photos rather than drawings. This finding is also reasonably well-established, e.g. Anderson (1960), Diamond (1968), Hendon (1973), Hanssens and Weitz (1980), Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 2).

Post-war trends identified by Pollay (1985) show increasing use of photographs in the ads -- from 62% in the 1950's to 82% in the 1970's -- and declining use of pen and ink drawings (10% to 6%), paintings (13% to 3%) and multi-media (13% to 6%).

Among the published recognition research studies examined, only Diamond looked at the combination of illustration media and illustration size which he called "layout", but reported no significant differences. Parker (1981) recommended using a large dominant illustration when appealing to the senses, a direction presumably applicable to tourism destination advertising.

Since the combination of illustration elements represents an important creative decision, it was included in the present study.

Number of Illustrations: Past researchers have had mixed findings regarding the number of illustrations shown in an ad. Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) showed increasing attention with increasing number of photos, and Assael, Kofron and Burgi (1968) and Fletcher and Winn (1974) found multiple illustrations superior, while Hendon (1973) reported a negative effect.

Illustration Size: From Twedt (1952) to Finn (1985), the size of the illustration has consistently been shown to be a major determinant of attention. However, there have been differences in the way illustration size is measured, i.e. by computing actual illustration area in square inches or square centimetres or by computing illustration area as a proportion of the total space in the advertisement. In 1962,

Ulin (reported in Fletcher and Winn 1974) found scores were unaffected by the dimensionality of the magazine page and that "... readers view an ad in the perspective of the magazine in which it appears." Hence the use of proportional rather than actual dimensions in the present study.

Illustration Shape: The shape of the illustration has not been tested with any degree of consistency or clarity by other researchers.

Illustration Position: Hendon (1973) reported a positive effect on Attention of positioning an illustration at the top of the page. This is the only study among those examined to look at illustration position effect. Coding was further expanded in the present study to cover the position of the illustration relative to the text.

TABLE 8: CONTENT VARIABLES RELATING TO THE PICTORIAL MESSAGE

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| SUBJECT OF ILLUSTRATION:** | | |
| City lights | 2 | 2 |
| Cityscape by day | 6 | 6 |
| Streetscene | 6 | 5 |
| Village/townscape | 3 | 3 |
| Food/restaurant | 19 | 21 |
| Accommodation | 5 | 5 |
| Nightlife | 4 | 3 |
| Tourists | 67 | 70* |
| Cultural/historical places | 24 | 22 |
| Ethnic festival/performing arts | 14 | 13 |
| Visual arts/crafts/artifacts | 14 | 12 |
| Nationals/hosts | 25 | 22 |
| Beaches/coast | 23 | 26 |
| Boats/sails/rafts | 30 | 33* |
| Other water - river, lakes, sea | 34 | 36 |
| Waterfalls/geyser | 5 | 5 |
| Forest/trees | 34 | 37 |
| Countryside | 4 | 5 |
| Mountains | 25 | 24 |
| Unique land forms | 5 | 5 |
| Sunset | 17 | 17 |
| Animals/fish/birds | 15 | 15 |
| Sports facilities | 8 | 9 |
| Winter/snow | 22 | 16* |
| Map | 5 | 4 |
| Brochures/guides | 7 | 5* |
| Transportation vehicles | 10 | 11 |
| Flowers | 9 | 9 |
| Other | 11 | 13 |
| ACTIVITY LEVEL OF AD: | | |
| Active/energetic | 36 | 38 |
| TOURISTS PARTICIPATE IN: | | |
| Boating | 11 | 12 |
| Other watersports | 9 | 10 |
| Adventure | 14 | 14 |
| Skiing | 7 | 8* |
| Golf/tennis | 7 | 8* |
| Sightseeing | 18 | 18 |
| Relaxing | 27 | 30 |
| Eating | 11 | 13* |
| Socializing | 17 | 19 |
| Romance | 20 | 23 |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| TOURISTS DEPICTED ARE: | | |
| Male only | 6 | 6 |
| Female only | 6 | 6 |
| Both sexes | 48 | 51 |
| Age/sex unclear | 8 | 6* |
| Children | 13 | 15 |
| Seniors | 4 | 5* |
| TESTIMONIAL USE: | | |
| Celebrity/expert | 2 | 2 |
| Citizen | 5 | 4 |
| No testimonial | 93 | 94* |
| SPECIAL LIGHTING EFFECTS: | | |
| Mist/spray | 3 | 3 |
| Orange/yellow light | 12 | 12 |
| Pink/lilac light | 7 | 7 |
| Reflections off water | 10 | 10 |
| Night floodlighting | 3 | 2 |
| None of above | 71 | 72* |

* Eliminated from the multiple regression analysis.

** Although illustration subjects were coded on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3, incidence reflects any inclusion of the subject.

People: The content variables defined are highly specific to tourism destination advertisements and generally cannot be compared with other research results. One exception relates to the inclusion of product and people in the illustration.

Post war trends showed increasing depiction of the product alone (14% in the 1950's to 49% in the 1970's) and decreasing depiction of both product and people in the advertisement, declining from 74% to 40% (Pollay 1985). Despite this trend, Parker (1981), in discussing effective print advertising, recommended showing a product in use. This presumably will require the inclusion of a user in tourism destination advertisements.

Fletcher and Winn (1974) and Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) found the number of people in the ad did not significantly affect Readership Scores; Anderson (1960) concluded that showing people sometimes reduced interest in an industrial product.

Hanssens and Weitz (1980) found the inclusion of a woman in the ad positively influenced scores for routine and unique products but showing a product in action had no effect.

Proprietal ad tests conducted for Alberta Tourism have repeatedly indicated that the depiction of people in tourism ads allow the readers to project themselves into the advertisement.

In the present study, codes were set up to cover the inclusion of tourists in the illustration, their sex and age and the activities in which they were shown to be participating (i.e. product in use).

Subjects: Most tourist destinations can offer a variety of tourism experiences or products. Each subject depicted in the illustrative material was identified and its importance in the total pictorial mix coded. The objective here was to establish whether

certain aspects of the product have greater power to generate readership than others.

Activity: Parker (1981) recommended using illustrative material which is not static and Anderson (1960) found that action in industrial ads was related to higher coupon returns than static illustrations. A code was included to allow subjective assessment of the activity in tourism destination advertisements.

Testimonial: Although testimonial ads are not used frequently, data collected in 1979/80 showed an average 26% advantage in Attention when celebrity endorsement was used, but no such difference for non-celebrity testimonials (Starch Tested Copy Vol. 1, No. 10). The incidence of use of testimonials in tourism destination ads is similar to general usage in the 1970's. Pollay (1985) demonstrated a gradual decline in the use of this approach from 8% in the 1950's to 6% in the 1970's.

Lighting Effects: Scenic pictures in tourism destination ads are frequently shown under "unusual" lighting such as at sunrise/sunset or where there is an interplay of light and water. Several basic codes were established to monitor the influence on readership of such effects.

## VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ASSOCIATION

Components which were considered to contribute to Association in this study were those which correlate strongly with the Association Readership Rate (see Chapter III). Table 9 and Table 10, which follow, cover variables selected to describe the Main Identifier, the Starch Identified Signature and the headline. Since the same variables were used for the Main Identifier and the Signature, both are shown in Table 9, while headline variables are shown in Table 10. Appendix A3 details coding instructions for the identification variables and for those relating to the headline.

TABLE 9: VARIABLES RELATING TO THE DESTINATION NAME AND STARCH IDENTIFIED SIGNATURE

| VARIABLE | IDENTIFIER(S) INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) ALL ID's** | ALL ADS (567=100%) MAIN ID | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) ALL ID's** | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) MAIN ID | STARCH SIGNATURE INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLACEMENT: | | | | | | |
| In headline | | | | | | |
| - total | 62 | 42 | 61* | 41 | 12 | 11* |
| - is headline | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 6* |
| - headline subject | 21 | 14 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 2 |
| - headline object | 28 | 17 | 26 | 14 | 4 | 3 |
| - part of headline | 6 | 4 | 8 | 5 | -- | -- |
| In themeline | | | | | | |
| - total | 39 | 22 | 42* | 26 | 25 | 27* |
| - themeline subject | 25 | 17 | 27 | 20 | 19 | 21 |
| - themeline object | 13 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| - part of themeline | 1 | + | 1 | -- | + | +* |
| Logo/signature | | | | | | |
| - total | 60 | 33 | 60* | 31 | 49 | 48* |
| - in coupon | 21 | 8 | 21 | 7 | 14 | 13 |
| - elsewhere | 39 | 25 | 39 | 24 | 35 | 35 |
| Part of name/ address | | | | | | |
| - total | 79 | -- | 79* | -- | 11 | 12* |
| - in coupon | 41 | -- | 42 | -- | 8 | 9* |
| - elsewhere | 38 | -- | 37 | -- | 3 | 3* |
| In text | 78 | -- | 77 | -- | + | +* |
| In caption | 14 | -- | 16 | -- | -- | -- |
| On brochure/ literature | 8 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| None | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | +* |
| VISIBILITY IN COMPARISON WITH HEADLINE: | | | | | | |
| Less prominent | | 24 | | 19 | 49 | 46 |
| Same as headline | | 22 | | 24 | 11 | 12 |
| More prominent | | 46 | | 50 | 35 | 37 |
| Is headline | | 7 | | 8 | 4 | 5 |

| VARIABLE | IDENTIFIER(S) INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) ALL ID's** | ALL ADS (567=100%) MAIN ID | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) ALL ID's** | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) MAIN ID | STARCH SIGNATURE INCIDENCE OF USE IN ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PERCENTAGE OF AD WHICH IS NAME: | 2*** | | 2.5*** | | 1*** | 1*** |
| PERCENT OF AD HEIGHT WHICH IS NAME HEIGHT: | 4*** | | 4*** | | 3*** | 3*** * |
| POSITION IN AD: | | | | | | |
| Spread across top | 15 | | 17 | | 4 | 5 |
| Top left | 3 | | 1 | | + | +* |
| Top centre | 1 | | 1* | | + | +* |
| Top right | 3 | | 3 | | 1 | 1* |
| Spread across middle | 2 | | 3 | | -- | -- |
| Middle left | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 |
| Middle centre | 4 | | 5 | | 2 | 1 |
| Middle right | 3 | | 3 | | 4 | 5 |
| Spread across bottom | 17 | | 18 | | 13 | 13 |
| Bottom left | 5 | | 5 | | 8 | 9 |
| Bottom centre | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | 10 |
| Bottom right | 37 | | 32 | | 56 | 53 |
| Left column | + | | 1* | | -- | -- |
| Right column | 1 | | 1* | | + | 1* |
| Several | + | | -- | | -- | -- |
| None | -- | | -- | | 1 | +* |
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | | |
| Destination name only **** | 24 | | 24 | | 19 | 19 |
| Includes an address **** | + | | + | | 14 | 15 |
| Includes a themeline **** | 30 | | 34 | | 36 | 39 |
| Includes an illustration | 32 | | 34 | | 49 | 50 |
| Reverse type | 29 | | 28 | | 18 | 14 |
| Print in colour | 29 | | 32 | | 23 | 28 |

| VARIABLE | IDENTIFIER(S) INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) ALL ID's** | MAIN ID | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) ALL ID's** | MAIN ID | STARCH SIGNATURE INCIDENCE OF USE IN ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Includes (an)other colour | 27 | | 29 | | 38 | 39 |
| Not horizontal | 7 | | 6 | | 6 | 5 |
| SIGNATURE AND MAIN IDENTIFIER ARE THE SAME: | 63 | | 62 | | 63 | 62 |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.

** Although identifiers are coded on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3, incidence reflects any placement of a name in that component.

*** Interval measure; incidence reflects median.

**** Content variables; all others are mechanical.

\+ Less than 0.5%.

DESTINATION NAME

Placement: A measure which has frequently been used in recognition research is the number of times the name of an advertised product appears in the ad (e.g. Valiente 1973 with positive impact, Holbrook and Lehmann 1980 with no significant impact). Since the Association Score is derived from seeing/reading the name of the product anywhere in the ad, rather than count the opportunities to see (many of which must be buried in the text since the tourism product itself does not carry a label), the placement of the name by component in which it appeared was coded.

Comparison of the positioning of the Main Identifier and Starch Designated Signature shows that the most prominent identifier is most often located in the headline, while the Starch Signature is infrequently located there.

Size: Identifier size was measured in three ways: as a percent of total ad space, height as a percent of total ad height, and prominence

in comparison with the headline. Diamond (1968) used the concept of rating prominence of the brand name. Though he concluded prominence had little effect on readership, his measure was somewhat more judgmental than the relative assessment of prominence against the headline.

Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) measured signature space and type size as did Finn (1985), both with non-significant results. Since these researchers dealt with the Starch Identified Signature, which is not necessarily the most important in creating Association, the measures were included both for the Main Identifier and the Signature. In addition, instead of following previous researchers and measuring actual type size in millimeters, relative height was established on the basis that the same ad in, for example, Reader's Digest and the New Yorker, would have a different actual type size but the same proportional height. This decision follows the rationale used for measuring illustration space versus square centimeters of illustration.

Position: Little attention has thus far been paid to where the name is placed in the ad itself. Finn (1985) categorized Signature position as top or bottom and left or right and showed a positive contribution to Association when the Signature was positioned at the top of the ad. More detailed positioning codes were established for this study.

Presentation: Parker (1981) recommended a "chaste signature", i.e. one which would not include a logo, list of offices, address or phone number. He also recommended avoidance of purely artistic typographical effects. Finn (1985) included five descriptors relating to the presentation of the Signature and seven relating to the presentation of the logo. He found that a Signature which included a logo and a Signature which combined a picture and word contributed positively to Association Scores. Several of these variables were adapted for inclusion in the study.

Signature = Main Identifier: Finally, a code was included to identify ads where the Starch Identified Signature was the same as the Main Identifier. While three in five ads showed this overlap, there remained significant differences between the two measures on all the other variables coded.

HEADLINE

Many of the variables used to describe a headline are similar in concept to those used for the Main Identifier and Signature. Most are considered mechanical.

Presentation: Parker (1981) made several suggestions regarding execution of an effective headline. These included avoidance of setting type at an angle, use of black type, and use of upper and lower case rather than all capitals. Finn (1985) tested these suggestions but they did not appear to influence readership. Since these ideas had not been tested by other researchers, they were included in the present study.

TABLE 10: MECHANICAL AND CONTENT HEADLINE VARIABLES

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| HEADLINE PRESENTATION: | | |
| Reverse type | 36 | 36 |
| Print in colour | 17 | 16 |
| All upper case (one size) | 22 | 21 |
| Not horizontal | 6 | 6 |
| POSITION IN AD: | | |
| Spread across top | 33 | 33 |
| Top left | 6 | 5 |
| Top centre | 1 | 1 |
| Top right | 10 | 9 |
| Spread across middle | 8 | 11 |
| Middle left | 4 | 2 |
| Middle centre | 3 | 4* |
| Middle right | 1 | 1 |
| Spread across bottom | 11 | 11 |
| Bottom left | 11 | 14 |
| Bottom centre | 1 | 1 |
| Bottom right | 5 | 2 |
| Left column | + | -- |
| Right column | 1 | 1* |
| More than 1 place | 5 | 5 |
| No headline | + | +* |
| POSITION RELATIVE TO ILLUSTRATION/TEXT: | | |
| Superimposed | 50 | 50 |
| Above illustration | 18 | 19 |
| Below illustration | 6 | 6 |
| Next to illustration | 2 | 2 |
| Above text | 7 | 4 |
| Below text | 3 | 3* |
| Between illustration and text | 12 | 15* |
| Combination | 2 | 1 |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF LINES IN HEADLINE: | 2** | 2** |
| NUMBER OF WORDS IN HEADLINE: | 5** | 5** |
| PERCENT OF AD WHICH IS HEADLINE: | 5** | 5** |
| PERCENT OF AD HEIGHT WHICH IS HEADLINE HEIGHT: | 4** | 4** * |
| HEADLINE CONTENT: | | |
| Personal reference | 17 | 18 |
| Interrogative | 1 | 1 |
| Imperative | 20 | 19 |
| Offers newness*** | 6 | 5 |
| Offers user benefit*** | 44 | 44 |
| Descriptive of destination*** | 24 | 21 |
| Imagery*** | 15 | 15 |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.

** Interval measure; incidence reflects median.

*** Content variables; all others are mechanical.

\+ Less than 0.5%.

Position: As with the illustration, the position of the headline was measured in several ways. Anderson (1960) found that positioning a headline right at the bottom of the page under the illustration resulted in higher Readership Scores; Finn (1985) found advantage in Association for a headline located at the top of the ad. For this study the same detailed categories as used for the Main Identifier and Signature were used to position the headline in the ad.

In addition, the position of the headline in the ad relative to the illustration or text was coded. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 8) reported that although 59% of 2,500 ads studied had headlines above the illustration, position beside or below the illustration provided an 8 to 10% advantage in Noting Scores. Similar results were also found for industrial ads (Starch Tested Copy Vol. 1, No. 12).

Size: Headline size has been measured repeatedly by researchers and in different ways. A

linear relationship with Readership Scores which decline with increasing number of words and number of lines in the headline was demonstrated in Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 8 and Vol. 2, No. 20). Rossiter (1981) found the number of words in the headline impacted Association Scores negatively and Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) found a similar relationship for words but not lines with Read Most Scores. However, others (eg. Hanssens and Weitz 1980, Finn 1985) have not found a significant relationship.

Headline size has also been measured in terms of the amount of space taken in the ad and in terms of the height of the largest letter as a percent of total ad height (Fletcher and Winn 1974) or headline type size (eg. Holbrook and Lehmann 1980, Finn 1985). Again, there have been mixed results.

Content: Dunn and Barban (1974) distinguished seven different types of headline including one

containing product news, one phrased as a question and one commanding the reader to do something. Soley and Reid (1983a) found no significant relationship between Dunn and Barban's types and Readership Scores, while Rossiter (1981) found interrogative and imperative headlines loaded negatively on Associated and Read Most Scores respectively. However, Soley and Reid (1983b) could not duplicate these results. Myers and Haug (1967) in an experiment comparing memorability of declarative and interrogative headlines found no significant differences between them.

Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 2, No. 17 and Vol. 2, No. 18) noted that higher scoring ads were "outstandingly characterized by news, curiosity, freshness in picture and headline". In Vol. 1, No. 8 Starch suggested that headlines containing the word "new", "now", "at last" or "improved" were likely to catch considerable attention.

Rossiter (1981) and Soley and Reid (1983b) found that use of a personal reference to

the reader (you/your) in the headline related positively to Readership Scores. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 8) also recommended that the headline "address the reader either directly by using the word 'you' or by using a construction that clearly implies the same."

Parker (1981) recommended that headlines contain a clearly stated promise of a well-defined benefit. It was suggested in Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 8, Vol. 2, No. 18) that a headline should appeal to the reader's self interest by referring to a specific reader problem that is associated with or creates desire and then offering a specific benefit or solution to the problem. Finn (1985) included a variable 'headline offers a benefit' but found no significant impacts.

Following the classification scheme described by Myers and Shoker (1981), three categories were established to describe the content of tourism destination advertisement headlines. These were: offers the user a

benefit, descriptive of the destination (an approach reported by Starch not to hold the reader's interest) and imagery/expressiveness. The latter covers expressive properties not intrinsic to the product, which may say more about the user than the product itself.

Several researchers have examined the effect of inclusion of the product name in the headline. Varying results have been obtained. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 8) reported no difference in scores when brand names were included in the headline. Rossiter's findings (1981), however, suggest the position of the product name as the headline object is advantageous. This aspect has been included in the present study under the destination name placement variable.

## VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ELABORATION

Advertisement components contributing to Elaboration as measured in Starch Readership Studies include all text in the ad. Thus, for the purposes of this study, components contributing to Elaboration include the text, captions, and any headings other than the headline. Because of their high correlation with Read Most Scores (see Table 4) coupons are included here too. Tables 11 and 12 cover mechanical and content variables used to describe the written material in the ads, and Table 13 covers the coupon descriptors and presence of other call-to-action variables. Appendix A4 details coding instructions for these variables.

### TEXT

Presentation: While a number of researchers have studied various aspects of the quantity of text used, few have paid attention to the way the text is laid out. Parker (1981) recommended that long copy be broken up using visual contrasts such as subheadings and that small pictures be captioned. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 1, No. 12) provided evidence that the

TABLE 11: MECHANICAL VARIABLES RELATING TO THE TEXT

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| TEXT PRESENTATION: | | |
| Interspersed with pictures | 13 | 14 |
| Paragraph headings | 28 | 26 |
| With numbered points | 2 | 1 |
| Captions to photos | 32 | 28 |
| Most text in captions | 7 | 5* |
| Text not horizontal | 3 | 2 |
| No text | 3 | 3* |
| POSITION IN AD: | | |
| Spread across top | 5 | 4 |
| Top left | 2 | 2 |
| Top centre | 2 | 2 |
| Top right | 4 | 5 |
| Spread across middle | 3 | 3 |
| Middle left | 2 | 1 |
| Middle centre | 1 | 1* |
| Middle right | 4 | 2 |
| Spread across bottom | 20 | 21 |
| Bottom left | 15 | 18 |
| Bottom centre | 1 | 2 |
| Bottom right | 13 | 13 |
| Left column | 3 | 3 |
| Centre column | + | +* |
| Right column | 5 | 4 |
| Scattered | 15 | 15 |
| Over 1/2 page | 1 | 1* |
| No text | 3 | 3* |
| TEXT COLOUR AND BACKGROUND***: | | |
| Black on white | 56 | 53 |
| Black on colour | 11 | 13 |
| Black on illustration | 10 | 11 |
| Reverse on black | 4 | 2 |
| Reverse on colour | 3 | 4 |
| Reverse on illustration | 22 | 20 |
| Colour on white | 3 | 2 |
| Colour on black | + | +* |
| Colour on colour | 1 | 1* |
| Colour on illustration | 2 | 2 |
| AVERAGE NUMBER OF LINES IN CAPTIONS: | 1** | 1** * |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF BLOCKS OF COPY IN MAIN TEXT: | 2** | 1** |
| NUMBER OF LINES OF COPY IN MAIN TEXT: | 14** | 13** * |
| NUMBER OF WORDS IN MAIN TEXT: | 50-99** | 50-99** |
| PERCENT OF AD WHICH IS MAIN TEXT: | 8** | 8** |
| MODAL TYPE SIZE RATIO IN MAIN TEXT: | 7** | 7** |
| NUMBER OF TYPE STYLES/ SIZES IN MAIN TEXT: | 2** | 1** |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.

** Interval measure; incidence reflects median.

*** Although each text colour combination was coded on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3, the incidence represents any use of that colour combination.

\+ Less than 0.5%.

presence of a caption to the main illustration had a beneficial effect on readership. The variables included under Presentation identify ads using some of these devices.

Position: Position of the main body of text in the ad was examined by Finn (1985) as being at the top or bottom, left or right of the ad, but was not found to impact Readership Scores. This variable is replicated here using more detailed position locators.

Colour: Parker (1981) recommended the use of dark type on a light background and avoidance of anything that makes reading of an ad difficult. This, in his opinion, included copy over an illustration, illustration over copy, and the use of reverse type.

The category Text Colour and Background covers the complete set of possible combinations of background and print colour in an ad and was coded according to the extent to which each combination was used.

Quantity: Daniel Starch (1966) reported a 1954 study which demonstrated a negative linear relationship between number of words in the text of an ad and Associated and Read Most Scores, with the Elaboration measure performing best where there were 50 words or fewer. Starch Tested Copy (Vol. 2, No. 20) reveals a 34% advantage in Elaboration for Wall Street Journal ads with fewer than 50 words, and a 17% advantage for those with fewer than 100, but no significant difference in Noting Scores.

Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) found no significant impact on overall Readership Scores for any measures of copy (number of blocks, number of lines, number of words, copy space, modal typesize in millimeters and number of different typesizes in ad).

In contrast, Diamond (1968) found that when the number of words in the copy exceeded 50 there was a decline in Readership Scores and especially in the Read Most Score. Fletcher

and Winn (1974) found a negative relationship between the number of words and the Association Score and Valiente (1973) found a similar relationship between number of words and number of copy blocks and the Noting Score.

Finn (1985) reported a positive relationship between the number of copy lines and Noting Scores. He also found a negative relationship between adjusted copy space and Noting, but a positive impact of this variable on Elaboration. Like Finn, Hendon (1973) reported that a small area of text contributed to the prediction of the Noting Score but Hanssens and Weitz (1980) found no significant contribution from text space, number of words or height of the largest copy size.

Given the varying results reported, codes were allocated for each of the measures undertaken by other researchers, i.e. number of copy blocks, lines, words, and type-styles/sizes. Space taken in the ad and

type height were calculated as a proportion of the ad/page. In addition, a variable recording number of lines in the caption was added.

Information: As with illustration variables describing the content of a tourism destination ad, the content variables describing the written material were also highly specific to the product group.

The first variable describing the specificity of information in the text was a subjective assessment of the extent of use of hard factual information on a five point scale.

The actual types of specific/factual information content were classified into six groups pertinent to tourism.

Appeals: Twenty-nine tourism specific appeals were established from the content analysis of the advertisements. Classification was based on both the presence and relative importance of

TABLE 12: CONTENT VARIABLES RELATING TO THE WRITTEN MESSAGE

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| SPECIFICITY OF INFORMATION IN TEXT: | | |
| Strongly general (1) | 23 | 25 |
| More general than specific (2) | 44 | 44 |
| Mixed (3) | 15 | 16 |
| More factual than general (4) | 5 | 3 |
| Strongly factual (5) | 10 | 9 |
| No text/obscured | 3 | 3 |
| FACTUAL INFORMATION CONTENT: | | |
| Price/specials | 8 | 5 |
| Services/distance | 12 | 8 |
| Information source | 81 | 82 |
| Specific names | 50 | 48 |
| Background information | 18 | 17 |
| Statistics/dates | 33 | 33 |
| APPEALS USED*: | | |
| Hospitality/friendliness | 38 | 36 |
| Natural appeal | 44 | 41 |
| Comparisons with other destinations | 14 | 13 |
| Everything in one country | 6 | 6 |
| Desirability among others (status) | 5 | 4 |
| Discovery/surprise | 21 | 22 |
| Appeal to emotions | 7 | 5 |
| Price value/exchange rate | 32 | 32 |
| Memories/memorable | 7 | 8 |
| Good vacation destination | 10 | 9 |
| Superlative | 30 | 26 |
| Shoulder season | 6 | 5 |
| Diversity/choice | 16 | 15 |
| Accessibility | 13 | 9 |
| Lack of crowding | 9 | 10 |
| Urban appeal | 25 | 24 |
| Foreign/different | 27 | 23 |
| Beaches and sea | 26 | 25 |
| Resorts | 13 | 14 |
| History and culture | 47 | 44 |
| Climate/sun | 19 | 22 |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | 10 | 12 |
| Skiing/winter | 9 | 8 |
| Cuisine/restaurants | 30 | 28 |
| Nightlife | 16 | 17 |

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| English-speaking | 4 | 3 |
| Accommodation | 25 | 25 |
| Shopping | 24 | 23 |
| Sports | 28 | 31 |
| EVOCATIVENESS OF TEXT: | | |
| Not (0) | 26 | 26 |
| Somewhat (1) | 34 | 35 |
| Highly (2) | 37 | 37 |

* Although appeals were coded on an ordinal scale from 0 to 2, incidence reflects any use of that appeal.

the appeal. Since the main theme was frequently stated by the headline, this component was included in the classification. As with the illustration subject, the objective here was to establish whether certain messages have greater power to generate readership than others.

Of these appeals, only three are measured, in their generalized form, in the literature examined. Pollay (1985) described a decline in the use of the tactic of general competitive comparisons from 37% in the 1950's to 19% in the 1970's. The use of superlatives is similar to Preston's definition of puffery, used by Vanden Burgh and Bartlett (1982), who found no significant difference in Readership Scores where puffery was and was not employed.

Holbrook and Lehmann (1980) found that status appeals (which imply social status will be enhanced in the eyes of others by the use of the product) significantly impact on all three levels of readership.

Evocativeness: In an attempt to capture the degree of affect evoked by the style of writing, a subjective assessment of the ability of the text to stimulate images or a perception of the atmosphere of the destination was made.

CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES

Type: Parker (1981) suggested that an effective advertisement would make it clear what the advertiser wants the reader to do, the "call-to-action". In tourism destination advertisements, actions other than encouragement to visit include entering competitions, sending in a coupon or letter requesting further information and phoning for such information. Coupons may be used more frequently in tourism destination ads (46%) than all ads in general. Pollay's study (1985) showed a strong growth trend in their use from 7% in the 1950's to 30% in the 1970's.

TABLE 13: MECHANICAL CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES

| VARIABLE | INCIDENCE OF USE IN: ALL ADS (567=100%) | 1P4 ADS (426=100%) |
|---|---|---|
| TYPE: | | |
| Sweepstakes | 1 | -- |
| Coupon | 46 | 48* |
| Directive in text | 66 | 66 |
| Phone/800 number | 28 | 31 |
| COUPON SHAPE: | | |
| Horizontal rectangle | 32 | 32 |
| Vertical rectangle | 7 | 6 |
| Square | 2 | 3 |
| Triangle | 2 | 3* |
| Irregular | 3 | 4 |
| COUPON BORDER: | | |
| Dotted line | 36 | 37 |
| Solid line | 7 | 7 |
| Colour contrast | 19 | 20 |
| No border | 3 | 3 |
| COUPON COLOUR AND BACKGROUND: | | |
| White on white | 16 | 16* |
| White on colour | + | + |
| White on illustration | 13 | 15 |
| Colour on white | + | +* |
| Colour on same colour | 9 | 10 |
| Colour on contrast colour | 1 | 1 |
| Colour on illustration | 4 | 3* |
| Illustration on illustration | 3 | 3 |
| COUPON POSITION: | | |
| Across bottom | 6 | 7 |
| Lower right corner | 29 | 31 |
| Lower left corner | 7 | 7 |
| Elsewhere | 4 | 3* |
| PERCENT OF AD WHICH IS COUPON: | 6** | 6** |

* Eliminated from multiple regression analysis.

** Interval measure; incidence reflects median.

Coupon: Starch (1966) reported that there was a close relationship between readership and clipping of a coupon. Thus, to maximize the number of enquiries generated, identification of features of the coupon which enhance readership should be of assistance. While tourism destination coupons do not have the same objectives as "cents off" coupons, their format is similar. A positive effect on Noting and Association Scores (approximately 10%) and a 29% impact on Read Most Scores where such coupons are present was reported in Starch Tested Copy (Vol. I, No. 13).

Measures of coupon appearance used in this study include the shape, border or contrast device, colour, position on page and size.

# V. RESULTS

Results of the various approaches to analysing the data obtained in this study are presented as appendices and discussed below. This chapter is set up to cover the following questions:

(i) Whether the addition of an extensive set of content (message) variables can contribute significantly to the explanation of variance in readership over and above that provided by mechanical variables when the product group is tightly controlled. Also whether such content variables have the predicted greater effect on Elaboration than on Attention.

(ii) Whether the independent variables entering a regression equation reflect the expectations of the Divergent Processing Effectiveness Model, namely that the ad's overall layout and main pictorial elements will have greater impact on Attention; the headline, Signature and smaller pictorial elements will have greater impact on Association and the copy characteristics will most influence Elaboration.

(iii) What specific independent variables help contribute to higher readership of a tourism destination ad.

A TECHNICAL NOTE

A number of false starts were made in producing multiple regression analyses. They had the following effects:

- Reduction in the number of independent variables from 324 used in the univariate analyses (i.e. T-Tests and One-Way ANOVA's) to 262. Those variables eliminated were noted in the tables in Chapter IV and the rationale for their exclusion discussed in Chapter III.

- Despite the application of pairwise analysis of the variables, the set of cases used for each multiple regression equation had to have complete information. Thus, N was reduced to the lowest common denominator, usually below 150. To overcome this problem, the missing values were either coded to equal the average value of the variable (eg. for the number of ads in an issue) or as not present. For example, where there was no coupon, the variables describing the coupon

had initially been defined as missing and were now recoded as not present. Most of the recoding was of the latter type.

It should be noted that the univariate results in Appendix D are based on the initial coding structure such that T-Tests, for example, reflect the difference between the means where tourists are shown in a romantic situation versus where tourists are shown doing something else and ads without tourists are ignored.

## THE ROLE OF CONTENT VARIABLES IN EXPLAINING VARIANCE

Four multiple regression analyses were run for each dependent readership variable in the study, excluding dependent variables where the number of independent variables was greater than the number of cases.

The four covered: mechanical variables only, content variables only, communication variables only, and a combination of all variables from the preceding three sets. There were 135 variables in the mechanical set, 88 covered content and 13 communication, a total of 236. An additional 26 were substituted where appropriate in the regression analyses for the Signature Readership Rate. Results are detailed in Table 14.

Several aspects of the data in general are notable:

(i) Mechanical variables accounted for a higher percentage of variance than content variables for every measure of readership.

(ii) The communication variables accounted for only a very small proportion of the variance and were most important for Elaboration measures.

TABLE 14: SEPARATE AND COMBINED PREDICTIONS OF THREE TYPES OF VARIABLES ON READERSHIP

| | | Readership Rates | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Noted Score | Association | Main Ident. | Signature | Headline | Read Some | Read Most |
| Mechanical: | | | | | | | |
| N of variables* | 16 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 13 |
| Highest R sq. change** | .073 | .100 | .044 | .231 | .179 | .026 | .088 |
| Lowest R sq. change*** | .007 | .006 | .007 | .006 | .006 | .010 | .008 |
| R sq. (Adjusted)**** | .341 | .387 | .298 | .404 | .457 | .165 | .282 |
| Content: | | | | | | | |
| N of variables | 14 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 12 |
| Highest R sq. change | .090 | .043 | .020 | .099 | .107 | .025 | .034 |
| Lowest R sq. change | .008 | .011 | .010 | .007 | .009 | .010 | .008 |
| R sq. (Adjusted) | .242 | .127 | .071 | .326 | .250 | .114 | .186 |
| Communication: | | | | | | | |
| N of variables | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Highest R sq. change | .012 | .017 | - | .070 | .055 | .053 | .052 |
| Lowest R sq. change | - | .012 | - | - | .010 | .015 | .010 |
| R sq. (Adjusted) | .009 | .023 | - | .068 | .070 | .108 | .086 |

| | Noted Score | Readership Rates: Associ-ation | Main Ident. | Signa-ture | Head-line | Read Some | Read Most |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Variables: | | | | | | | |
| N of variables | 30 | 27 | 21 | 16 | 21 | 20 | 15 |
| Highest R sq. change | .090 | .100 | .044 | .231 | .179 | .053 | .088 |
| Lowest R sq. change | .005 | .006 | .007 | .005 | .005 | .008 | .008 |
| R sq. (Adjusted) | .500 | .444 | .331 | .448 | .511 | .307 | .324 |

* Number of variables in final equation.

** Highest contribution to total variance of one variable.

*** Lowest contribution to total variance of one variable.

**** Total variance explained.

(iii) With few exceptions, the amount of variance accounted for by any one measure is low, showing that once size, colour, product group and initial attention are controlled, no single variable is a major contributor to readership; rather, a wide variety of variables need to be used to predict readership. This may well be a reflection of the enormous number of potential combinations of options available to the creative director.

With regard to the mechanical-content argument itself, the research shows that prediction of the three overall readership measures is in the same range as those obtained by other researchers, despite the extensive inclusion of product-specific message variables. However, these R squares are achieved after controlling for variables which have proven to be the most important contributors to readership variance. Thus, explanation of advertisement performance has, in fact, been considerably extended.

Mechanical variables on their own were only able to account for two-thirds of the total variance in Noting Scores explained when all variables were included, and just over half the variance in the Read Some Rate. For

other readership rates, mechanical variables were far more dominant, accounting for close on 90% of the total variance explained.

The proportion of mechanical, content and communication variables entering each of the final equations is shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15: PROPORTION OF MECHANICAL AND CONTENT VARIABLES ENTERING OVERALL STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT READERSHIP

| | Mechanical | Content | Communi-cation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Attention: | | | |
| Noted Score | 53% | 37% | 10% |
| Association: | | | |
| Association Rate | 85% | 7% | 8% |
| Main ID Rate | 81% | 19% | -- |
| Signature Rate | 69% | 25% | 6% |
| Headline Rate | 81% | 19% | -- |
| Elaboration: | | | |
| Read Some Rate | 50% | 35% | 15% |
| Read Most Rate | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| Distribution of all variables | 57% | 37% | 6% |

This pattern suggests that mechanical variables are of greatest importance in creating Association and increasing readership of the name of the destination and the headline.

It also points to a higher than average impact for communication variables on Elaboration Rates.

The distribution of mechanical, content and communication variables entering the Noting equation is in similar proportions to the full set of variables used. In comparison with the other readership distributions, content plays a major role in creating Attention and reflects visual content in particular (see Appendix B1). The only other readership equation with a high content component is the Read Some Rate where the content represents a mix of visual and written message (see Appendix B5).

These findings show the same pattern as suggested more indirectly in Table 14. They indicate that the actual message being communicated by the ad (visual and/or written) assists in catching attention and in drawing the reader into the text. Readership of other elements such as the headline and Main Identifier, as well as thorough readership of the text is more dependent on mechanical or layout considerations. Thus, the present study clearly shows that specific message-content variables, as well as communication variables, do have a significant role to play in predicting ad readership.

Given the expectation that message-content would have a stronger impact on Elaboration than Noting, the results are in conflict with a priori predictions. The role of message-content is strong both for Noting and Elaboration, but in the latter case only in drawing readers into the ad, not in sustaining interest.

## THE DIVERGENT PROCESSING EFFECTIVENESS MODEL

In Chapter II the correlation coefficients between the various dependent variables were examined to see what light they might shed on the way in which advertisement readers process the information in the ad. It was found that within the constraints of the Starch definition of Association and Read Most Readership, the Seen Illustration variables correlated most strongly with the Noting Score; the Association Rate correlated most strongly with the Main Identifier, the Starch Identified Signature and the headline; captions, directives and coupons correlated closely with Elaboration Measures; and subheading/text heading and themelines showed a strong relationship both to Elaboration and Association.

Additional separate linear regression analyses using the variables describing each component as input resulted in the adjusted R squares shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16: $R^2$(ADJ) OF COMPONENT VARIABLES ENTERING SEPARATE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT READERSHIP

| | Noted | Associ-ation | Read Some | Read Most | Head-line |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Illustration | .273 | .151 | .099 | .122 | .205 |
| Main Identifier | .208 | .205 | .051 | .097 | .386 |
| [Signature] | [.108] | [.145] | [.061] | [.065] | [.293] |
| Headline | .145 | .114 | .027 | .055 | .305 |
| Text | .170 | .223 | .132 | .200 | .204 |
| Call-to-action | .131 | .059 | .039 | .058 | .050 |

Examination of the data shows that illustration variables are the best predictors of Attention; text and identification variables are the strongest predictors of Association and text variables best predict Elaboration. The Main Identifier is the best predictor of headline readership.

Findings here that would not be suggested by theory, include the relatively strong explanation of variance in Association Rate by text variables and weak explanation by headline variables. Examination of the univariate data in Appendix D supports the patterns described by the above regression results.

Given the differences between theoretical predictions and the data patterns examined, it must be concluded that processing of an advertisement appears far more complex than the information processing paradigm might suggest. Attention, for example, is influenced not only by the visual content (illustration and layout) of the ad, but also by creative factors affecting other components. Thus the written message, which theoretically should be processed at the stage of Elaboration, impacts Attention scores.

Further investigation of theoretical information processing models is required. The rigidly defined Starch Scores may, however, not be the optimal base on which to validate predictions.

## INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES FOR INCLUSION/EXCLUSION IN A TOURISM DESTINATION ADVERTISEMENT

### CONGRUENCE OF DIFFERENT ANALYTICAL APPROACHES

Individual variables which enter the total regression equations are listed in Appendix B. For the Noting Score and Read Most Rate only half the variables entering the equation were found to be significantly related to Attention and Elaboration on a univariate basis and the proportion was even lower for the Association Rate. Where the variables did correspond, the direction of influence (i.e. the sign) was mostly, but not always, the same.

Since each ad is made up of a unique combination of features, and needs to be unique to compete for attention, it is more useful to predict the effects of many small decisions than to apply a more parsimonious model representing an average configuration. This is doubtless the reason why such a schism exists between applied research into Starch Readership Scores (as exemplified by findings reported in Starch — Tested Copy) and that published in the academic literature.

As the present study is intended for practical application, the success of the general equations in

predicting overall readership was tested on the ads not included in the multiple regression analyses themselves i.e. on the ads in the sample smaller and larger than one page in size. Since size itself is an important determinant of Noting Score, its effects were neutralized by obtaining Pearson Product-Moment correlations between the estimated and observed scores for these advertisements. A really good fit could not be expected since size also impacts the feasibility of particular layout decisions, eg. the type-size ratio of half-page horizontal ads would be greater than for one page ads. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 17.

Overall results were best for two page four colour spread ads, but even here the fit between the predicted and observed results was better for some readership measures than others. Prediction of Association Rate and Main Identifier Readership Rate was particularly poor.

TABLE 17: PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR ESTIMATED AND OBSERVED READERSHIP MEASURES

| | All Non-1P4 Ads | All 4 Colour Non-1P4 Ads | 2 Page 4 Colour Spreads |
|---|---|---|---|
| N of Ads | 141 | 107 | 47 |
| Noted Score | .2330** | -.0012 | .3062* |
| Association Rate | .1489* | .0605 | .0512 |
| Read Some Rate | .0352 | .2150* | .2625* |
| Read Most Rate | .2657*** | .3076*** | .4652**** |
| Headline Rate | .2816**** | .3483**** | .4604*** |
| Main ID Rate | .1353 | .1039 | -.0239 |
| Signature Rate | .3027**** | .2840** | .2475* |

Note: One-tailed significance at **** .000 level
*** .001 level
** .01 level
* .05 level

Given all of the above, a detailed written analysis of only the variables entering the general regression equations will not be presented here. Since the most important of the variables entering each of the general regression equations (Appendix B) were also found in the component specific equations (Appendix C) and were usually also significant in the univariate analyses (Appendix D), the results of all three approaches will be taken together in the discussion which follows.

## COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

Communication variables which appear to contribute significantly to overall readership are shown in Table 18.

TABLE 18: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATION VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foreign destination | + | - | + | + |
| With co-sponsor | | | | -- |
| Travel magazine | | | - | - |
| General magazine | | | +++ | +++ |
| Women's magazine | | | -- | + |
| Page number | - | ++ | +++ | +++ |
| Right-hand side | +++ | -- | | |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

Since a number of communication variables were examined only in the univariate analyses, they will be discussed first.

Format of Ad

Both Starch INRA Hooper and other researchers have recommended using a single ad format or controlling for size and colour when analysing advertisements. The

results obtained here (see Appendix D1) showed the same significant differences as found in previous studies. In order to maximize the amount of information on which factors within the ad itself contribute to higher readership, it is necessary to control for this effect. As explained in Chapter II, only the 1P4 format was selected for further analysis.

Findings concerning the size of the ad are particularly clear-cut and show the following impact on Noting Scores for four colour ads:

| Ad Size | Noting Score | Index |
|---|---|---|
| 1/2 page | 33% | 66 |
| 2/3 page | 39% | 81 |
| 1 page | 50% | 100 |
| 1 1/3 page | 56% | 114 |
| 2 page | 58% | 120 |
| Larger | 70% | 140 |

Thus a two page ad (double your money) will bring a 20% increase in Attention, on average, over the most popular one page format. Smaller ads appear to be a better buy since they generate proportionately more Attention than their cost would indicate.

Results concerning the shape of the ad indicate that horizontal or spread ads perform better than vertical.

However, the results appear strongly influenced by the presence of two page and larger spreads since direct comparisons where the amount of space is equal but the shape is different yield mixed results. For example, one page ads show vertical with significantly higher scores, two-third page ads show horizontal as significantly higher and one and one-third page ads show no significant difference -- though each of the pairs involved small bases.

The results concerning colour are noteworthy too. Although the use of colour increases the total audience, once a black and white ad is noted it is also more likely to be read thoroughly.

Publication Date

Univariate results in Appendix D1 reveal increased Association Rates with more recent year of publication. One can speculate that tourism destinations are becoming increasingly effective in putting their names forward as the competition for market share in a maturing tourism market increases.

The results concerning month of publication suggest less interest in tourism destination advertisements in the fall and early winter months. However, since the seasons do not respect the chronological calendar, the Noted Scores for individual months were examined separately for foreign and domestic destinations. Higher than average Noting for foreign destination ads occurred in January, February, March, May, June and July. The average scores found in April may be a reflection of heavy competition for attention in this month, which carries one-fifth of all tourism advertisements. Actual distribution of ads over the months (Table 6) suggests that January, February, June and July may be underutilized for promoting foreign tourism destinations.

Sex of Reader

One communication variable which was included in the regression analyses that did not prove significant was the sex of the reader. Interest measures concerning travel, discussed in Chapter II, had indicated that there would be no significant differences between the sexes and this expectation was upheld.

Region Advertised

Table 18 suggests that there is some advantage to advertising a foreign destination rather than a domestic one in the U.S. market. Further analysis of Canadian and other foreign ads separately, pinpoints the source of the negative Association Rate as lying with Canadian advertisements. Examination of the Canadian ads themselves leads to the conclusion that the problem is probably not inherent in the destination, but a problem with the presentation of the destination name which is frequently smaller than average.

Co-sponsorship of Ad

Co-operative ads in which a destination advertises together with a commercial sponsor do not differ in their drawing power from others, but do have a problem sustaining readership through most of the text. Further comments will be made on this subject in the discussion on written messages.

Type of Magazine

The type of magazine in which the ad is published appears to affect Elaboration Scores. General interest magazines

perform better than the others and travel magazines somewhat worse. The latter finding may well be a reflection of the effect of the larger number of competitive destination ads in any one issue of a travel magazine. It is interesting that clutter does not appear to detract from seeing an ad or identifying the sponsor, but that the longer time needed to read the ad is not given. One can only speculate about the reason for the more intense readership of tourism destination ads in a general magazine. Perhaps there is less competition among ads or a higher propensity of the reader of such magazines to read rather than only look at pictures.

Position in Magazine

A conflicting relationship pointing to the right-hand side of the magazine as preferable for increasing Noting Scores and the left-hand side for increasing Association was obtained. Since increase in Noting is followed by increases in other Readership Scores, and hence in audience size for all levels of Readership, a right-hand side position is preferable overall.

Position of the ad in the issue had the unexpected result of showing increasing Elaboration Rates with higher page

numbers (i.e. further back in the magazine) as well as a higher Association Rate. There is a possibility of a spurious relationship here, as Sunset Magazine, which contributed 43% of the ads tested and 86% of the travel magazine category, positions travel advertisements in the first half of the magazine. Since this group performed significantly worse on the Read Most Readership Rate than other magazines, the strong positive finding for higher page number may be a reflection of scores for the other magazine types. A rerun of the data without the travel magazine category yielded results in the same direction, though at a reduced significance level, suggesting that the relationship is a real one. The positioning effect may be due to editorial decisions regarding the distribution of ads and editorial through the magazines.

Application of the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure indicated that ads placed in a cover position had significantly higher Attention Scores (at the .05 level) than those in inside positions.

ILLUSTRATION VARIABLES

Illustration variables which showed a significant relationship to readership measures are shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL ILLUSTRATION VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EXECUTION: | | | | |
| With bleed | +++ | | ++ | + |
| With photographs* | + | + | | |
| 1 main and inset photos | -- | + | | |
| 1 main and non-inset photos | + | + | | |
| 1 photo | ++ | | | |
| Photo and drawing | - | - | | - |
| Multiple drawings | - | -- | | |
| QUANTITY: | | | | |
| Number of Illustrations | - | - | | |
| % of ad which is illustration | ++ | | | ++ |
| SHAPE AND POSITION: | | | | |
| Vertical rectangle | | --- | | |
| Square | | ++ | | |
| Top down position | + | - | - | |
| Left | | + | | - |
| Scattered illustrations | | + | +++ | |
| Above text | | -- | | |
| SUBJECTS: | | | | |
| Food/restaurant | -- | | + | |
| With tourists* | | | + | + |
| Ethnic festivals/ performing arts | - | - | | |
| Visual arts/crafts/ artifacts | --- | | | |
| Beaches/coast | +++ | | | ++ |
| Mountains | | | -- | - |
| Unique landforms | | | --- | |
| Sunset | | | - | -- |
| Animals/birds/fish | | | | -- |
| Sports facilities | -- | + | + | |

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOURIST PARTICIPATION: | | | | |
| Watersport | + | | + | + |
| Skiing* | - | - | | |
| Romance | +++ | + | + | + |
| TOURISTS ARE: | | | | |
| Male only | - | | | - |
| Female only | ++ | | | |
| Both sexes | - | + | + | ++ |
| Citizen testimonial | | + | + | |
| No special lighting effects* | | | + | + |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Not included in the regression analyses; maximum reading is one.

Use of Bleed

As frequently found in other studies, bleed ads showed a significant advantage over non-bleed advertisements in creating Attention. They also have an effect on Elaboration.

Execution of Illustration

Again consistent with previous research, photos proved more beneficial to readership (Noting and Association) than mixed media or drawings alone.

In particular, a single photo is most successful in drawing Attention while the use of small photos superimposed on a larger one appears to detract from Attention. Multiple drawings have a particularly negative impact on Noting and Association.

The use of a main photo with smaller pictures assisted in increasing Association Rates, possibly because this type of layout frequently involves the use of captions. Since more than one-half of all ads with captions include the destination name in the caption and since Association

Rates are higher where there are captions, it is probably not the small photos per se that result in an increased Association Rate.

Number of Illustrations

Given the above results it is not surprising to find that there is a decline in Attention to an ad with increase in the number of separate illustrations included. Further analysis of the data shows that use of a single illustration yields the highest Noting Score (significant at the .000 level).

Illustration Size

Consistent with the findings of other researchers, this study also shows the positive contribution of increasing the size of the illustration on Attention. In addition, larger size illustrations appear to contribute to increased Elaboration Scores, though this finding probably reflects the use of smaller amounts of text rather than illustration size per se.

A special run of the data showed that as the size of the illustration increased, the number of blocks of copy, the

number of words in the main text, and the space taken by the main text all decreased linearly (significance level .000). The negative relationship between amount of text and Elaboration Scores is discussed later in this chapter.

Shape and Position of the Illustration

The most notable finding concerning the layout factors of shape and position of the illustration is that they do not seem to have an important impact on Attention Scores. Their greatest influence is on Association. Illustrations placed at the top of the ad, above the text or shaped in a vertical rectangle appear to detract from Association, suggesting that the name may be hard to find or that the layout does not encourage noters to seek further information.

A square shape contributes to higher Association Rates as do scattered illustrations. The latter is also associated with a higher Read Some Readership Rate, though the relationship is probably due to the increased use of captions or small amounts of text typical of this type of layout, rather than the placing of the illustration.

## Illustration Content Which Attracts Attention

Destinations which can feature beaches/coast in their illustration have a distinct advantage. Associated with this, at least in part, is the high Noting Score for ads showing tourists taking part in water sports other than boating.

There is a strong response to advertisements showing a couple in a romantic situation. This finding holds true even when ads appearing in Modern Bride are excluded from the data set. In addition, the finding is true for both male and female readers. Use of tourist models in romantic situations also appears to contribute to increased levels of Association and Elaboration.

Where only female models are shown in the ad, there is a significant increase in Attention, again among readers of both sexes. Although the use of models of both sexes is more advantageous for Association and Elaboration Rates, the raw scores are still higher when only females are depicted.

Illustration Subjects Associated with Low Attention Scores

As with illustration content contributing to increased Attention, a few themes are apparent in the subject matter associated with lower Noting Scores.

Ads featuring visual and performing arts and restaurants/food are less attractive than other subjects.

The Stanford Research Institute has developed a market segmentation schema, Values and Lifestyles, which divides the American population into nine groups. The Societally Conscious group, which is one of the most important in terms of foreign travel (26% of such travellers versus 11% of the population) is particularly interested in gaining knowledge about the host destination. This includes mixing with local residents, eating their food and learning about the local culture. One would have to assume that although the mass of American magazine readers may not be interested in these items in a destination, specific target markets within the whole group would react differently. Since Starch tested advertisements do not permit segmentation, the results relating to content can only act as guidelines for a shotgun approach to marketing.

Examination of other variables scoring lower on Attention would seem to bear this out. Sports facilities, which include golf courses, tennis courts, cricket ovals and race tracks and ski ads would appeal only to a specific segment of interested participants. They are also somewhat exclusive and expensive and contribute to lower Noting Scores. In contrast, the less exclusive adventure group, covering camping, hiking, fishing and riding, shows no impact either way.

Low Association Rates for skiing may be misleading. Most were Canadian ads which featured small destination names and this, rather than the subject matter, is more likely to be the reason for the low Association Rate.

Illustration Subjects Impacting on Elaboration

Where tourists are shown in an illustration there is a significant impact on the Read Most Readership Rate. This finding is congruent with qualitative findings that readers are more likely to project themselves into a situation when the ad depicts people.

Use of citizen testimonials, i.e. other visitors, and avoidance of special lighting effects are also associated

with high text readership levels. In contrast to the results where the illustration includes people, those including animals/fish/birds are likely to be associated with lower readership of the text.

Since such "spectaculars" as mountains, other unique landforms and sunsets are associated with low Elaboration Rates, one might speculate that a picture can say too much and totally overwhelm the written message.

## IDENTIFIER AND SIGNATURE VARIABLES

The findings regarding the Main and other Identifiers used in the ads are shown in Table 20 and those concerning Starch Identified Signature variables in Table 21. The written analysis focuses primarily on the Main Identifier.

Based on information processing theory, it was expected that variables identifying the sponsor of the ad would have their greatest impact on Association Rate. Table 20 reflects this pattern but also shows heavy impact on Noting Scores.

TABLE 20: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL DESTINATION NAME VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Main ID Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLACEMENT: | | | | | |
| In headline - total* | | + | | - | |
| Is headline | + | | - | - | |
| Headline subject | | ++ | | | |
| Themeline object | + | ++ | | + | |
| Logo/signature - total* | | - | | | - |
| Logo/signature in coupon | - | - | | - | -- |
| Part of name/ address - total* | - | - | | | - |
| Name/address in coupon | -- | | -- | - | |
| Name/address elsewhere | - | +- | + | +++ | |
| In text | -- | | | -- | |
| In caption | | ++ | + | | |
| On brochure/ literature | -- | + | | | |
| SIZE: | | | | | |
| Visibility in comparison with headline | | + | | | + |
| Percent of ad height which is height of name | | +++ | | | +++ |
| POSITION: | | | | | |
| Spread across top | | + | | - | |
| Top left | | | | | -- |
| Top right | | +++ | | | + |
| Middle centre | -- | -- | | | |
| Spread across bottom | ++ | - | - | | |
| Bottom centre | -- | ++ | | | ++ |
| Bottom right | + | -- | | | |

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Main ID Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | |
| Destination name only | ++ | | + | ++ | |
| Includes a themeline | + | ++ | | ++ | |
| Includes an illustration | --- | -- | | -- | |
| Reverse type | + | ++ | | | |
| Includes (an) other colour | - | - | | | |
| Not horizontal | | | -- | - | |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Not included in regressions analyses; maximum reading is one.

TABLE 21: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SIGNATURE VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score* | Association Rate* | Read Some Rate* | Read Most Rate* | Signature Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLACEMENT: | | | | | |
| In headline - total** | + | + | | | + |
| Is headline** | + | + | | | + |
| In themeline - total** | | | | + | + |
| Themeline object | ++ | + | + | + | + |
| Logo/signature - total** | | - | | | - |
| Logo/signature in coupon | -- | | | - | |
| Logo/signature elsewhere | | | | | -- |
| SIZE: | | | | | |
| Visibility in comparison with headline | | + | | | ++ |
| Percent of ad which is name | | ++ | | | ++ |
| Percent of ad height which is name height** | | + | | | + |
| POSITION: | | | | | |
| Spread across top | | | - | | + |
| Middle left | + | + | | | ++ |
| Middle centre | | | -- | | |
| Middle right | | ++ | | | |
| Spread across bottom | + | | | + | |
| Bottom left | -- | | | | |
| Bottom centre | -- | ++ | | | +++ |
| Bottom right | | - | | - | - |
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | |
| Destination name only | ++ | | ++ | + | ++ |
| Includes a themeline | | ++ | | | ++ |
| Includes an illustration | -- | -- | - | -- | |
| Reverse type | ++ | + | + | | + |
| Not horizontal | | | -- | -- | -- |

| | Noted Score* | Association Rate* | Read Some Rate* | Read Most Rate* | Signature Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Signature and main identifier are the same | | - | | ++ | +++ |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Signature variables not included in regressions using all variables; thus maximum reading is two.

** Not included in the regression analyses; maximum reading is one.

## Placement in Ad Components

The actual location of the destination name in different components of an advertisement may have positive or negative effects on readership.

### (a) Headline

Use of the destination name in the headline has a positive effect on Association Rates, but the part of the headline to be used is not clearly defined by these results. In fact, unlike Rossiter (1981), a significant relationship was found for positioning the name as the headline subject not as the headline object!

When the Main Identifier is also the headline, a strong positive impact on Noting Scores is obtained. There is also the curious finding that both Elaboration Rates and raw scores are negatively impacted where the headline contains the destination name. Could this imply that further information seeking is halted once both the destination and main message are identified?

Headline readership itself is significantly higher where the destination name is included and particularly if this

is the most prominent rendering of the name (both at the .000 level).

(b) Themeline

Inclusion of the destination name as the object of the themeline appears to generate a consistently positive impact across all levels of readership. It also has a significant impact on readership of the themeline itself (at the .01 level).

(c) Logo/Signature and Name/Address

Although the apparent effect of using a logo or distinctive signature is to reduce readership, there may be confounding of the effects of the execution of the name, i.e. as a logo/signature, and its placement in the ad.

Negative relationships between readership and the placement of an identifying logo/signature or name/address in a coupon suggests that the problem lies with the coupon rather than with the identifier. Nevertheless, use of a distinctive logo/signature elsewhere in the ad does not appear to make any difference to readership, while

inclusion of the name as part of an address to which to write has a positive impact on Elaboration.

(d) Text

Inclusion of the destination name in the text is associated with lower Attention Scores and Elaboration Rates. This finding is, however, not a causal one, but a reflection of the increasing likelihood of inclusion of the destination name in the text with increase in the total amount of text in the ad (number of lines and number of words in the main text and percent of ad which is the main text, significant at the .000 level).

(e) Caption

Inclusion of the destination name in captions to photos has a beneficial effect on the Association Rate.

(f) Brochure/Literature

In much the same way as a brand name is featured on a product, a destination name may be shown on a literature piece such as a vacation planner or brochure featured in

an advertisement. The results show increasingly poorer Noting Scores with increasing reliance on this device to communicate the name of the destination.

Size

The relative size of the Main Identifier is a major, if not the major contributor to the Association Rate, however it is measured. The height of the letters, the relative prominence of the destination name compared to the headline and, for the Signature, the proportion of space taken in the ad, all show that the larger the name the higher the Association Rate. Readership of the Main Identifier itself appears particularly likely to be impacted by the height of the letters.

Position in Ad

Advantageous positions in the ad for the Main Identifier in terms of the Association Rate include being spread across the top of the ad, in the top right corner, and in the centre at the bottom. The bottom right corner, the most frequently used position, and the middle centre appear to have a negative impact on Association.

Noting Scores benefit where the Main Identifier is spread across the bottom of the ad. The use of bold type in this position generally seems to have a positive effect on Attention since, as will be seen later, a headline spread across the bottom of the ad is also advantageous to Noting Scores.

Presentation

Simplicity appears to be the key to execution of an identifier. Where the Main Identifier and Signature include only the name of the destination, a significant positive relationship with Attention and Elaboration was established, while the inclusion of an illustration (including a logo) and additional colour was detrimental to readership.

Use of reverse type was related to higher readership while the placement of the name at an angle in the ad detracted from further Elaboration.

Finally, it appears advantageous for the Starch Signature to be the Main Identifier since readership of the Signature itself is greater under these circumstances. Elaboration Rates are also significantly higher but the

reason for this is not clear. Possibly where the Signature and Main Identifier are the same, there are fewer areas in the ad competing for attention, allowing the reader to focus on the bulk of the text rather than another area featuring the name.

HEADLINE

As with the Main Identifier and Signature, variables describing the headline were expected to have their major impact on Association Rates. The results of the analyses, shown in Table 22, suggest that the relationship here too is more diverse.

Presentation

The strongest result relating to the presentation of the headline concerns the use of reverse type which is advantageous for both Association and readership of the headline itself.

Execution in colour, or setting of the headline at an angle appears to increase attention to the ad, while the use of only upper case letters in one size is beneficial to headline readership too.

TABLE 22: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL HEADLINE VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Headline Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | |
| Reverse type | | ++ | | | + |
| Print in colour | + | | | | + |
| All upper case (one size) | | + | - | | + |
| Not horizontal | + | + | | | |
| POSITION: | | | | | |
| Spread across top | | | ++ | ++ | + |
| Top left | | | | | --- |
| Top right | | ++ | | | |
| Spread across middle | | + | | | + |
| Middle centre* | - | | | - | |
| Spread across bottom | ++ | -- | - | - | + |
| Bottom left | + | - | | + | - |
| Bottom right | | | | | ++ |
| More than one place | -- | + | - | - | |
| Above illustration | -- | | | | |
| Below illustration | ++ | | | +++ | + |
| Next to illustration | | | -- | - | |
| Between illustration and text | ++ | | | | -- |
| SIZE: | | | | | |
| Number of words in headline | -- | | | | --- |
| Percent of ad which is headline | | ++ | | | +++ |
| Percent of ad height which is headline height* | + | + | | | + |

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Headline Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CONTENT: | | | | | |
| Personal reference | | | | + | + |
| Imperative | --- | | | | |
| Offers news/ newness | -- | -- | - | | |
| Descriptive of destination | | -- | | | -- |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Not included in the regression analyses; maximum reading is one.

Position in Ad

If, as believed by advertising practitioners, the headline serves to pull the reader into the body of the text, one would expect to see a relationship between the variables describing the headline and Elaboration Rate. In fact, such linkages occurred almost exclusively for the position of the headline in the ad.

Positive impacts on Elaboration were found where the headline is below the illustration, spread across the top of the ad and in the bottom left corner. Of these positions, placement below the illustration (where it covers less than 100% of the ad) is most advantageous since Noting Scores and headline readership are higher here too.

Although readership of the headline itself is positively impacted when it is spread across the ad (top, middle or bottom) this is probably a reflection of headline size rather than actual position. However, a headline spread across the bottom of the ad is beneficial to Attention but not Association -- a similar finding to that obtained for the Main Identifier.

Positions to be avoided are the centre of the advertisement and placement above or next to the illustration. Breaking up a long headline into different positions in the ad is also detrimental to readership.

Size

The size of the headline is significantly related to the Association Rate for the advertisement and to the readership rate for the headline itself. The larger the proportion of the ad taken by the headline and the larger the height of the headline letters, the higher the readership rates.

While the number of lines in the headline does not significantly impact readership, the number of words is a contributor. The more words in the headline, the lower its readership.

Content

The use of personal references and user benefits is well established in tourism destination advertisements. Personal references contribute to readership of the headline itself and to Elaboration but references to benefits have no significant impact either way.

Headlines phrased as imperatives or which offer news about/newness as an appeal are negatively associated with Noting Scores. Headlines which describe the destination in physical terms had both a low Association Rate and a low headline readership rate.

Future researchers should consider adding the new categories derived from an analysis of award-winning headlines by Beltramini and Blasko (1986) since further insight into what makes an effective headline is needed.

TEXT VARIABLES

Text variables were anticipated to be of particular importance to measures of Elaboration. An overview of Table 23 shows that they impact all readership levels.

Contrasting of the Read Some and Read Most Readership Rate reaffirms the greater importance of the text itself to thorough readership seen earlier in Table 16.

TABLE 23: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL TEXT VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRESENTATION: | | | | |
| Paragraph headings | | | -- | -- |
| With numbered points | | ++ | + | + |
| Captions to photos | | +++ | + | |
| Most text in captions* | + | + | + | + |
| No text* | + | | n/a | + |
| POSITION: | | | | |
| Spread across middle | - | | - | |
| Bottom centre | | - | + | -- |
| Right column | | | - | - |
| COLOUR: | | | | |
| Black on white | | --- | | -- |
| Black on colour | + | + | | |
| Black on illustration | | -- | - | |
| Reverse on illustration | | + | + | |
| Colour on colour* | | | + | + |
| QUANTITY: | | | | |
| Number of lines of copy* | - | | | - |
| Number of words | - | | | - |
| Percent of ad which is main text | --- | | | -- |
| Modal type-size ratio | | | --- | --- |
| Number of type styles/sizes | | | + | + |
| INFORMATION CONTENT: | | | | |
| Services/distance information | | - | | - |
| Information source | --- | | | |
| Statistics/dates | -- | | | |

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| APPEALS USED: | | | | |
| Natural appeal | | - | --- | -- |
| Comparisons with other destinations | | ++ | + | |
| Everything in one country | ++ | | | |
| Memories/memorable | | + | - | |
| Superlatives | | | | -- |
| Foreign/different | | -- | | - |
| History and culture | - | | | - |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | + | + | +++ | +++ |
| Accommodation | + | | | - |
| Evocativeness of text | + | ++ | | - |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the number of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Not included in the regressions analyses; maximum reading is one.

n/a Not applicable.

Presentation

The use of captions to photos is positively linked to higher Association Rates. When most of the text is in captions other Readership Scores benefit too.

The use of numbered points in the text positively influences Association and Elaboration Rates, while paragraph headings appear to detract from Elaboration measures. This is a similar situation to the headline where one would expect that paragraph headings lead the reader into the text, but in fact they appear to satisfy in themselves.

Position in Ad

The position of the main body of text in the ad does not seem to have significant effects on readership. The findings in Table 23 suggest that use of the middle of the ad and bottom centre and right column positions should be avoided.

The position of the text relative to other ad components results in low Association Rates when the text is below the illustration (see Table 19) and high Noting Scores

when the headline is between the illustration and text (see Table 22). However, such layout variables do not affect Elaboration Rates.

Colour of Background and Text

The colour of the text and its background has its greatest impact on Association. Black type, either on a white background or superimposed on an illustration, has a negative effect on Association. Black on flat colour (including a photographic background such as a plain blue sky) or reverse type on an illustration have the opposite effect.

Although black on white appears to detract from thorough readership of the text, this combination is significantly associated with decreasing illustration size (at the .000 level) and increasing amounts of text. Since the interactive effect is limited to the Elaboration measure, the colour of the text itself contributes to the low Association Rate.

Quantity of Text

The size or quantity of text has its strongest impact on thorough readership and also plays an important role in Attention.

Highly significant negative relationships between Noting and the number of lines of text, number of words and the amount of space in the ad taken by the main body of text were found. Examination of the detailed data shows that Noting Scores are considerably higher where up to 10 lines, 99 words and 4% of the space in the ad, rather than higher quantities, is devoted to the main body of text.

Consistent with these results is the positive impact on Noting of having no text at all or the positioning of most text in captions to photos.

As with Attention, Elaboration Rates are increasingly negatively impacted by the inclusion of increasing amounts of text. An interesting addition here is the significant detrimental effect of a high type-size ratio. Since the ratio itself represents the number of lines of text that do or would fill 10% of the height of the ad, the higher

the number, the more crowded it will appear and possibly the more difficult it will be to read. The Read Most Rates are highest where the ratio is four lines of type or less (including spaces between the lines) for 10% of the height of the ad, which in 1P4 ads is usually about 2.7 centimeters. This finding is significant at the .05 level. Currently only a few 1P4 ads (2.5%) fall into this group though a somewhat higher proportion of all ads in the sample (7%) use this ratio.

In addition, the use of multiple type styles or sizes appears to contribute to increased readership of the text.

Information in Text

The scale measuring degree of specificity/factualness of the ad did not show significant linear relationships with readership, implying that neither a general/persuasive ad nor a specific/informative one is superior to the other.

Examination of advertisements which included various types of hard information showed that, as with the overall assessment of information, inclusion in the text of specific place names/things to see and do and natural/cultural/historical background information had no significant effect on readership.

Where significant effects were found, they resulted in lower readership. Facts which involve statistics/dates and those detailing distances/accommodation/transportation/other services have this negative impact. As co-operative advertisements tend to include similar supplier driven information, content may be the reason for the lower Read Most Scores where co-sponsors are used (see Table 18).

Given the frequency with which focus groups criticize tourism destination advertisements for not including enough "information", one has to wonder what they have in mind or whether in reality a print advertisement is not an appropriate vehicle for delivering tourism information.

If tourism destination advertisements are to be purely persuasive, some mechanism by which interested readers can get further information is needed. The category "information source" includes all ads with such suggestions. These cover the use of coupons, addresses to write, pictures of vacation planners and referrals to "your travel agent". Consistent with the other types of information examined, the inclusion of such sources shows a significant negative impact. Given the earlier negative finding concerning the inclusion of the destination name

in a coupon or on a literature piece (Table 20), the result is perhaps not surprising. However, the same result is obtained when ads with a coupon or literature/brochure are excluded from the analysis.

Appeal/s Employed

The appeals used in the written part of the ad cover the message communicated by the text, headline, subheading and themeline. In many instances they would closely reflect the illustration content of the advertisement too (eg. history and culture, skiing, beaches and sea) so the relationship to readership is not as clear-cut as for other components.

Of the original group of 29 appeals, only one has a significant positive impact on all readership figures. The message communicating relaxation/slowing one's pace/enjoying quiet is particularly likely to lead to high Elaboration and can be effectively supported in an illustration (possibly the source of the positive Noting Score).

The only other appeals with a positive impact on readership lie in making general or specific comparisons with

other destinations which impacts Association Rate, and claiming to have everything in one country which impacts Noting Scores.

Another appeal which positively impacts Association Rates is the suggestion concerning the memorability of a vacation at that destination.

Two appeals which are or have been used by Canada and its provinces, viz. foreignness/differentness/uniqueness and nature/wildlife/scenic beauty/wilderness/countryside do not work with the broad cross-section of readers covered in this study. Both the Association and Elaboration Rates are lower than for other appeals. As pointed out in the discussion of illustration subjects, the results reflecting the effectiveness of a shotgun approach may be quite different for targetted market segments. For example, foreignness may be a positive factor for international travellers, but the readers sampled here would include a high percentage of domestic only travellers. On the other hand, if Canada is the safe and not-too-foreign alternative for domestic travellers, and if the marketing objective is to expand the market, then these appeals may be ones to be avoided.

Other appeals with a negative effect which might be avoided include the use of superlatives, eg. magnificent, awesome, incredible, and historical/cultural topic areas.

Evocativeness of Text

Unlike the research concerning the inclusion of hard factual information, Attention and Association in tourism destination advertisements appear to benefit from a writing style which conjures up vivid images of or a feeling for the atmosphere at the destination. The impact on Elaboration, however, appears to be a negative one.

CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES

The impact of the use of call-to-action variables and the appearance of coupons is displayed in Table 24.

TABLE 24: FREQUENCY AND DIRECTION OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES AND READERSHIP

| | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Coupon Rate* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TYPE: | | | | | |
| Coupon** | - | | - | - | n/a |
| Directive in text | - | | | - | |
| Phone/800 number | -- | + | | | |
| COUPON SHAPE: | | | | | |
| Horizontal rectangle | + | | | + | |
| Vertical rectangle | - | | | - | + |
| Triangle** | | - | | | - |
| Irregular shape | - | | | - | |
| COUPON BORDER: | | | | | |
| Dotted line | + | | + | + | |
| Solid line | | -- | | | |
| Colour contrast | | +++ | | | + |
| No border | - | | --- | -- | -- |
| COUPON COLOUR: | | | | | |
| White on white** | | - | | | - |
| Colour on illustration** | | + | | | + |
| COUPON POSITION: | | | | | |
| Across bottom | | --- | | | - |
| Bottom right corner | + | - | +++ | + | |
| Bottom left corner | - | + | | - | |
| Percent of ad which is coupon | --- | | - | -- | ++ |

Note: (1) The number of +'s or -'s indicate the make of analyses in which the variable was significantly related to the Readership measure at the 0.05 level or better. Variables with only one significant reading are excluded.

(2) + indicates a positive relationship.

- indicates a negative relationship.

* Full multiple regression to predict coupon readership not run since the number of variables was greater than the number of cases; thus the maximum reading is two.

** Not included in the regression analyses; maximum reading is one.

n/a Not applicable.

Type of Call-to-Action Variable

Based on results already discussed, it is no surprise that inclusion of a coupon in a tourism destination advertisement has a significant detrimental effect on Attention and Elaboration. This is true for both male and female magazine readers. Given Starch results showing a positive impact for "cents off" coupons, the reasons deserve investigation.

Inclusion of a phone number/toll free number is also associated with lower Noting Scores as are other text directives.

The Coupon Itself

Not only are Noting Scores and Elaboration Rates significantly lower when a coupon is included in a tourism destination advertisement, but as the size of the coupon increases, such negative effects increase too. However, readership of the coupon itself increases as it increases in size.

Association Rates are negatively impacted where the coupon is positioned across the bottom of the ad, where the

border is a solid line, the shape is a triangle, and the colour is white on a white background. Other negative effects are found particularly where there is a lack of any defining border. The use of a vertical or irregular shape and a position in the bottom left corner contributes to lower readership too.

Despite the coupon's negative impact on readership, there are aspects which contribute to increased Attention, Association and Elaboration. A position in the bottom right corner is particularly effective. The use of colour contrast and a colour background when the coupon is superimposed on an illustration, a horizontal rectangular shape and a dotted line border all appear to increase readership measures.

# VI. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

### ELEMENTS IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS

Advertisers of foreign destinations have a built-in advantage over domestic destinations in gaining attention and readership. As anticipated, no major differences between male and female readers were found overall or for specific content variables, so these audiences may be addressed with the same campaign.

The most effective type of magazine in which to advertise appears to be a general interest one (dominated by the New Yorker in this sample). Where travel magazines are used, care should be taken to meet optimal guidelines for execution of the main body of text.

Placement of the advertisement on the right-hand side of the magazine and further back in the issue appears advantageous. Ads themselves should be executed in full colour. Use of larger advertisements increases attention

but smaller advertisements are a more cost-effective buy. To obtain the same total audience they would need to be placed more frequently.

## OPTIMAL LAYOUT OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Synthesis of the detailed analysis of the various key elements in tourism destination advertisements suggests the following mechanical structure for a higher scoring advertisement.

A single captioned photograph, covering the entire advertisement and using the bleed process is recommended for creation of high attention. All copy should be superimposed using reverse type unless there are suitable flat coloured areas where black can effectively be used for the text.

The main identifier/signature, as the key contributor to creation of a link in the reader's mind between the advertisement and its sponsor, should optimally be placed as the object of a themeline. Execution should ensure that this is the most prominent copy in the ad,

particularly with regard to the height of the letters. A position at the bottom centre of the advertisement is recommended.

To be most effective, the headline should contain a personal reference since this appears to encourage further readership of the text. While not being more dominant than the main identifier, it needs to take a large amount of space if it is to be seen, be positioned across the top of the ad and contain as few words as possible.

High text readership is encouraged by short copy (under 100 words), taking no more than 4% of the total area of the ad. The use of large type (approximately 4 lines per inch) is recommended. A call-to-action is best executed in a line of copy in the form of a name and address to which to write.

The overall thrust of the above layout is simplicity. Only a few key areas of the advertisement compete for attention and each of these requires minimal processing. Introduction of multiple pictures, inset photographs, pictures of literature pieces, a coupon, a multi-coloured logo/signature appears to result in fragmentation of

attention. A small illustration area, drawing rather than photo, and large amounts of text are also disincentives to readership.

OTHER COMMENTS ON LAYOUT

Where a photograph smaller than the full ad has to be used, a vertical rectangular shape should be avoided. A square shape with the headline below the illustration is preferable. If the text is not superimposed, it should be executed in black on a coloured background and not in black on white.

If several smaller photos are to be used, these should be scattered around the ad and the text placed in captions to the photographs.

While the optimal position for the main identifier is in the themeline, inclusion of the destination name in the headline as the subject of the headline or where the headline is the name only, can also be advantageous. The destination name assists in creating headline readership but appears to detract from further elaboration.

If the main identifier cannot be placed at the bottom centre, positive alternatives are to have it spread across

the top or bottom of the advertisement or in the top right corner, but not the bottom right corner or anywhere on the left of the advertisement.

Alternative executions of the headline not detrimental to readership include the use of upper case, colour type and a non-horizontal position. Placement of the headline in the centre of the advertisement, above or next to the illustration or broken up into more than one area should be avoided.

Text should not be spread across the middle of the advertisement nor placed at the bottom centre. Multiple type styles or sizes and numbered points may be used to break up long text but paragraph headings should not be used.

The use of coupons is discouraged. However, if one is to be included it should be placed in the bottom right corner, have a horizontal rectangular shape with a dotted line border and a contrasting coloured background, particularly when superimposed on an illustration. Shapes to be avoided are a triangle, vertical rectangle and an irregular shape. The lack of any border, use of a solid

line border, execution in white on a white background and a position spread across the bottom of the ad or in the bottom left corner is particularly detrimental to readership. Size of the coupon depends on objectives. Larger size results in higher coupon readership but lower scores on most other key measures.

Although it was initially intended that detailed recommendations be made regarding readership of sub-headlines, themelines, captions and directives, the bases for the readership scores proved to be too low to undertake a full regression analysis and recommendations can therefore not be made.

## OPTIMAL MESSAGE FOR THE ADVERTISEMENT

When a broad cross-section of the magazine reader population is being targetted, the tourism destination advertisement should use sex appeal in the form of a female model or a couple pictured in a romantic situation. Depiction of tourists encourages readership of the main body of text. Testimonials by non-celebrity visitors can be effectively used too.

For visual appeal, beaches/coast and water sports (excluding boating) are advantageous.

The written message with broadest appeal is relaxation/ quiet/slowing down. Attention is generated by claims of everything in one country and Association is high where comparisons are made with other countries or where the appeal of memorability is used.

OTHER COMMENTS ON MESSAGE

Visual images focusing on ethnicity (eg. visual and performing arts, food and restaurants) and a written message primarily concerned with history/culture should be avoided. Also to be avoided are exclusive participatory sports such as golf, tennis and skiing when targetting the broad population.

Special lighting effects such as sunsets, and scenic spectaculars such as mountains and unique landforms, appear to detract from text readership. Particular efforts should be made here to ensure that mechanical variables associated with low text readership are avoided if such illustrative material is used.

Headlines should not be phrased as imperatives and should not merely describe the physical characteristics of the destination or present news about it.

The written message should avoid use of empty superlatives and, for the mass market, should avoid focusing on the topic areas of nature and foreignness/uniqueness.

Heavy factual and service information is a disincentive to readership (eg. where to get further information, statistics/dates, distances/accommodation/transportation/facilities) while use of colourful descriptive text which allows the reader to project into the destination appears to be beneficial.

## THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

### MESSAGE-CONTENT VARIABLES

One of the most notable aspects of the preceding recommendations is the relative sparsity of comment on specific illustration subjects and written messages to be included or excluded from a tourism destination advertisement. This is especially puzzling in light of the important contribution such specific content variables together made to explanation of variance in predicting readership measures and particularly Noting Scores and Read Some Rates. It has been hypothesized that the problem stems from the blanket measurement of all issue readers covered by the Starch methodology. In effect, the differences that are obtained are valid only when marketing to a broad cross-section of magazine readers. Thus, even when the product group is narrowly defined, message-content variables will play a lesser role in predicting readership since different segments of the audience will be interested in and respond to different appeals (messages), thus cancelling each other out. Mechanical variables, which are more universal, will by default have the most significant readings.

To paraphrase Myers (1986) 'Advertising is not a science. Have our attempts to make it numerative led us into spurious mathematics?' The open disbelief of advertising people regarding the apparent lack of importance of creative, which has historically been suggested by research using mathematical techniques, would seem to have a valid foundation. Content in tourism destination advertisements is important, but as its impact is confined to a receptive (interested) audience, which may well be only a segment of the total readership, it cannot be accurately assessed using typical Starch samples.

Future research using recognition scores to test the importance of message-content variables should be carried out in a single product group which is still sold to an unsegmented market. Alternatively, such variables need to be classified into more general categories which describe the kind of thing being shown or said rather than the specific appeal being used.

INFORMATION CONTENT OF THE AD

With regard to the information-persuasion controversy, based on the frequently repeated request by travellers, it was expected that tourism destination advertisements containing 'information' would have higher readership.

In fact, there was no support for this contention and some evidence to indicate that the opposite might be true. Six types of hard information were defined. Three proved to have no significant impact on readership and three had a negative impact. The subjective scale on degree of factualness showed no difference. However, all of these measures were based on the written content of the ad and it is not known whether a tourism destination picture is indeed worth a thousand words.

More research into this content area is sorely needed.

INFORMATION PROCESSING

While this study was not set up to examine Finn's Divergent Processing Effectiveness Model (1985), several results obtained raised questions regarding its applicability to Starch scored advertisements. Finn suggested that initial attention would involve processing of the primary pictorial content and layout of the advertisement. Results showed that in addition to the above, Noting Scores are influenced by the way the destination name and headline are presented and by the written appeal used in the ad. Theoretically, these components should not be processed at the first level.

Furthermore, the level of Association is predicted to include such characteristics as the headline, signature and smaller pictorial elements. Yet Starch Association is defined only as seeing the name of the product anywhere in the ad and the results show that illustration and text layout variables play a major role in predicting Association, even when the influence of Attention is controlled.

At the level of Elaboration, copy characteristics are expected to be determinants of text readership. However, readership of a coupon, a small but distinct visual/layout element which is frequently the home of the signature and is thus expected to help predict Association, is more strongly correlated with Read Most and Read Some Rates. Visual content variables are also strongly related to text readership even when Noting Scores are controlled.

The process of seeing/reading an advertisement therefore appears somewhat more complex than the model would imply.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to provide information which would be of assistance to creative personnel in developing more effective tourism destination advertisements for the U.S. market.

Over 500 such advertisements were examined and more than 300 communication, mechanical and content variables describing the ads defined. Using multiple regression, those variables which best predict a tourism destination advertisement's ability to capture a broad magazine audience, ensure that the destination's name is noticed and encourage readership of the text were identified. The resulting equations were tested against advertisements not included in the original analysis set with mixed results. Thus, the findings of a series of univariate analyses using T-Tests and One-Way ANOVA's and a second set of multiple regressions were also examined to determine trends in the data.

Recommendations were then made regarding communication, layout and message variables and their combinations which should be included or avoided in tourism destination advertisements.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Anderson, L. How research can boost ad effectiveness by 10%. Industrial Marketing, May 1960, pp. 39-43.

Assael, H., Kofron, J.H. and W. Burgi. Advertising performance as a function of print ad characteristics. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1967, pp. 20-26.

Beltramini, R.F. and V.J. Blasko. An analysis of award-winning advertising headlines. Journal of Advertising Research, April/May 1986, pp. 48-52.

Buzzell, R.D. Predicting short-term changes in market share as a function of advertising strategy. Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. I, August 1964, pp. 27-31.

Diamond, D.S. A quantitative approach to magazine advertisement format selection. Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. V, No. 4, November 1968, pp. 376-386.

Dunn, S.W. and A.M. Barban. Advertising: Its role in modern marketing. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1974.

Edmonton Journal, The. October 20, 1986, pp. A10.

Finn, A. Print ad effectiveness scores: An information processing perspective. Working paper, October 1, 1985.

Fletcher, A.D. and P.R. Winn. An intermagazine analysis of factors in advertisement readership. Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 51, Autumn 1974, pp. 425-430.

Fletcher, A.D. and S.K. Zeigler. Creative strategy and magazine ad readership. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1978, pp. 29-33.

Hanssens, D.M. and B.A. Weitz. The effectiveness of industrial print advertisements across product categories. Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. XVIII, August 1980, pp. 294-306.

Hendon, D.W. How mechanical factors affect ad perception. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1973, pp. 39-45.

Heller, N. Moran's "Measuring exposure to advertisements". Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1951, pp. 77-78.

Holbrook, M.B. and D.R. Lehmann. Form versus content in predicting Starch Scores. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 20, No. 4, 1980, pp. 53-62.

Hornik, J. Quantitative analysis of visual perception of printed advertisements. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 20, No. 6, 1980, pp. 41-48.

Kassarjian, H.H. Content analysis in consumer research. Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1977, pp. 8-18.

Krugman, H.E. The measurement of advertising involvement. Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 4, 1966, pp. 583-596.

Krugman, H.E. What makes advertising effective? Harvard Business Review, March-April 1975, pp. 96-103.

Krugman, H.E. Memory without recall, exposure without perception. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1977, pp. 7-12.

Krugman, H.E. Low recall and high recognition of advertising. Journal of Advertising Research, February/March 1986, pp. 79-86.

Lambin, J-J. What is the real impact of advertising? Harvard Business Review, May-June 1975, pp. 139-147.

Leigh, J.H. and A. Menon. A comparison of alternative recognition measures of advertising effectiveness. Journal of Advertising, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1986, pp. 4-12.

Lewis, R.C. Getting the most from marketing research, Part V. Predicting hotel choice: The factors underlying perception. The Cornell H.R.A. Quarterly, February 1985, pp. 82-96.

Lucas, D.B. and S.H. Britt. Measuring advertising effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Marder, E. and M. David. Recognition of ad elements: Recall or projection. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 1, No. 6, 1961, pp. 23-25.

McDaniel, S.W. Multi-collinearity in advertising related data. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 21, No. 3, 1981, pp. 61-63.

Moran, W.T. Measuring exposure to advertisements. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1951, pp. 72-77.

Moran, W.T. A reply to Heller's note. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1951, pp. 78-79.

Myers, J.H. and A.F. Haug. Declaritive versus interrogative advertisement headlines. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1967, pp. 41-46.

Myers, J.H. and A.D. Shoker. The nature of product related attributes. In: J.N. Sheth (Ed.) Research in Marketing, Volume 5. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc., 1981, pp. 211-236.

Myers, M. The risk of research. Marketing, December 15, 1986, pp. C15.

National Task Force on Tourism Data. Working papers, 1986.

Neu, D.M. Measuring advertisement recognition. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 1, No. 6, 1961, pp. 17-22.

Ogilvy & Mather. Trends in travel and tourism advertising expenditures in United States measured media, 1982-1986. July 1987.

Parker, R.B. Advertising: A handbook of effectiveness in print. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1981.

Pollay, R.W. The subsiding sizzle: A descriptive history of print advertising, 1900-1980. Journal of Marketing, Vol. 49, Summer 1985, pp. 24-37.

Resnik, A. and B.L. Stern. An analysis of information content in television advertising. Journal of Marketing, Vol. 1, January 1977, pp. 50-53.

Rossiter, J.R. Predicting Starch Scores. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 21, No. 5, 1981, pp. 63-68.

Russell, J.T. and C.H. Martin. How ad agencies view research. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 20, No. 2, 1980, pp. 27-31.

Simmons, W.R. Controlled recognition in the measurement of advertising perception. Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 3, 1961, pp. 470-471.

Singh, S.N. and C.A. Cole. Forced choice recognition tests: A critical review. Journal of Advertising, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1985, pp. 52-58.

Soley, L.C. and L.N. Reid. Industrial ad readership as a function of headline type. Journal of Advertising, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1983a, pp. 34-38.

Soley, L.C. and L.N. Reid. Predicting industrial ad readership. Industrial Marketing Management, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1983b, pp. 201-206.

Soley, L.C. and L.N. Reid. Satisfaction with the informational value of magazine and television advertising. Journal of Advertising, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1983c, pp. 27-31.

SPSS Inc. SPSSx User's Guide, Edition 2. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1986.

Starch, D. Measuring advertising readership and results. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Starch INRA Hooper. Starch Tested Copy. Vol. 1, No. 1 to Vol. 2, No. 21, 1980 onward (?).

Stern, B.L., Krugman, D.M. and A. Resnik. Magazine advertising: An analysis of its information content. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1981, pp. 39-44.

Twedt, D.W. A multiple factor analysis of advertising readership. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3, 1952, pp. 207-215.

Valiente, R. Mechanical correlates of ad recognition. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1973, pp. 13-18.

Vanden Burgh, B.G. and N. Bartlett. Puffery and readership of magazine ads. Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 57, No. 4, 1982, pp. 645-649.

Zielski, H.A. Does day after recall penalize "feeling" ads. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 22, No. 1, 1982, pp. 19-22.

Zinkhan, G.M. An empirical investigation of aided recall in advertising. In: Leigh, J.H. and C.R. Martin (Eds.) Current issues & research in advertising. University of Michigan, 1982.

Zinkhan, G.M. and B.D. Gelb. What Starch Scores predict. Journal of Advertising Research, August/September, 1986, pp. 45-50.

## APPENDIX A

Appendix A details the codes used in the analyses reported in this document.* The majority of codes are in their original form, but some represent codes created using computer instructions.

Unless otherwise specified, where dichotomous coding is shown (0-1), the 0 represents absence of a variable and the 1 represents presence of that variable.

---

* Additional codes established, but not used for analytical purposes include: name of country/state/province; name of magazine in which published; format of ad, i.e. combination of shape, colour and size.

A1 - COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sender: | | | |
| REGION | 0 | Domestic | - All U.S. states and U.S. offshore properties. |
| | 1 | Foreign | - All foreign countries and Canadian provinces. |
| COSPONS | 0 - 1 | Co-op partner | Co-operative ad with commercial partner, usually an airline, railway or hotel. |
| SUBDESTN | 0 - 1 | Subdestination | Subject of ad is a specific region/city, but sponsored by country/state/province. |
| Medium: | | | |
| MAG1 | 0 - 1 | Travel | - Southern Living, Sunset. |
| MAG2 | 0 - 1 | Outdoor | - Field & Stream, Golf, Golf Digest, National Geographic, Tennis, Ski, Ski Magazine, Sports Afield. |
| MAG3 | 0 - 1 | General | - Newsweek, New Yorker, Omni, Philadelphia Magazine, Reader's Digest, Time. |
| MAG4 | 0 - 1 | Home | - Better Homes and Gardens, House and Garden, House Beautiful. |
| MAG5 | 0 - 1 | Women's | - Family Circle, Glamour, Mademoiselle, Modern Bride, True Story, Vogue. |
| MAG6 | 0 - 1 | Business | - Business Week, Dun's Review, Esquire, Forbes, Fortune, U.S. News and World Report. |
| MAG7 | 0 - 1 | Black | - Ebony, Essence. |
| YEAR | 0 - 5 | 1980 - 1985 | Year of publication. |
| MONTH | 1 - 12 | Jan. - Dec. | Month of publication. |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| PAGE | 000<br>Actual | Cover (any) | Page on which advertisement appeared. |
| | | | Side of magazine on which ad first appears, eg. spread = 0. |
| SIDE | 0 | Left | - Even page #. |
| | 1 | Right | - Odd page #. |
| ISSUEADS | Actual | | # of ads in the issue. |
| COLOUR | 1 | Black and white | Colour of advertisement. |
| | 2 | Two colour | |
| | 4 | Four colour | |
| SHAPE | 0 | Horizontal/ spread | Shape of advertisement. |
| | 1 | Vertical | |
| SIZE | Actual | | Size of ad in pages, eg. 0.5, 1.3, 2.0. |
| Recipient: | | | |
| SEX | 1 | Male | Sex of reader; also recoded under SEX.2 as 0 = Male, 1 = Female, blank = unknown. |
| | 2 | Female | |
| | 3 | Unknown | |

## A2 - VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ATTENTION

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| MARGIN | 0 - 1 | Bleed | Code bleed (1) if any photo in the ad extends to the edge of the page. |
| | | | Type of illustration used. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| EXECUTN1 | 0 - 1 | Multiple photos | - 4+, none dominant |
| EXECUTN2 | 0 - 1 | 2 - 3 Equi-weighted photos | - Photos similar in size |
| EXECUTN3 | 0 - 1 | 1 main + non-inset photos | - 1 large and smaller photos |
| EXECUTN4 | 0 - 1 | 1 main + inset photos | - 1 large and smaller photos super-imposed |
| EXECUTN5 | 0 - 1 | 1 main photo | Also recoded as: ILLTYPE1 = Photos |
| EXECUTN6 | 0 - 1 | photo + drawing | - Separate or superimposed<br>Also recoded as: ILLTYPE2 = Mixed |
| EXECUTN7 | 0 - 1 | 1 main drawing | |
| EXECUTN8 | 0 - 1 | Multiple drawings | - 2+, none dominant<br>Also recoded as: ILLTYPE3 = Drawing |
| EXECUTN9 | 0 - 1 | No illustration | |
| NO. ILLUS | Actual | | # of separate illustrations |
| | | | Position of illustration in ad. Code as present in one position (1), absent in others (0). |
| ILLPOSN1 | 0 - 1 | Full ad | - Illustration covers whole ad (include non-bleed ads) |
| ILLPOSN2 | 0 - 1 | Top down | - Illustration positioned at top of the ad |
| ILLPOSN3 | 0 - 1 | Bottom up | - Illustration positioned at bottom of the ad |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| ILLPOSN4 | 0 - 1 | Centred | - Illustration centred in ad |
| ILLPOSN5 | 0 - 1 | Left | - Illustration on left side of ad |
| ILLPOSN6 | 0 - 1 | Right | - Illustration on right side of ad |
| ILLPOSN7 | 0 - 1 | Scattered | - Several illustrations scattered around ad |
| ILLPCT | 0 - 100 | Illustration as percent of ad space | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{L(Ill) \times H(Ill)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ where i = illustration<br>- Superimposed text or headline is included. Contrasting coloured blocks of text or coupon are excluded. White margins are part of ad but not of illustration. |
| ILLSHP1 | 0 - 1 | Full ad | Shape of illustration/block of illustrations. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| ILLSHP2 | 0 - 1 | Horizontal rectangle | |
| ILLSHP3 | 0 - 1 | Vertical rectangle | |
| ILLSHP4 | 0 - 1 | Square | |
| ILLSHP5 | 0 - 1 | Irregular | - Scattered illustrations; uneven edge; contains contrasting inset block of text or large coupon |
| ILLSUB1 | 0 - 3 | City lights | Subject(s) depicted in illustration. For each code:<br>0 = not present<br>1 = secondary subject (minor presence in illustration; in small inset only)<br>2 = main subject (may be one of several)<br>3 = Only subject |
| ILLSUB2 | 0 - 3 | Cityscape by day | |
| ILLSUB3 | 0 - 3 | Streetscene | |
| ILLSUB4 | 0 - 3 | Village/townscape | |
| ILLSUB5 | 0 - 3 | Food/restaurant | |
| ILLSUB6 | 0 - 3 | Accommodation | |
| ILLSUB7 | 0 - 3 | Nightlife | |
| ILLSUB8 | 0 - 3 | People as tourists/ participants | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| ILLSUB9 | 0 - 3 | Cultural/historical places/castles/ ruins/unusual architecture | |
| ILLSUB10 | 0 - 3 | Ethnic festival/ pageants/ceremonies/ costumes/performing arts | |
| ILLSUB11 | 0 - 3 | Visual arts and crafts/historical artifacts | |
| ILLSUB12 | 0 - 3 | People as nationals/ hosts | |
| ILLSUB13 | 0 - 3 | Beaches/coast | |
| ILLSUB14 | 0 - 3 | Boats/sails/rafts | |
| ILLSUB15 | 0 - 3 | Other water - rivers, lakes, canals, sea | |
| ILLSUB16 | 0 - 3 | Unusual waterforms - waterfalls, geyser | |
| ILLSUB17 | 0 - 3 | Forest/trees | |
| ILLSUB18 | 0 - 3 | Countryside | |
| ILLSUB19 | 0 - 3 | Mountains | |
| ILLSUB20 | 0 - 3 | Unique landforms | |
| ILLSUB21 | 0 - 3 | Sunset | |
| ILLSUB22 | 0 - 3 | Animals/fish/birds | |
| ILLSUB23 | 0 - 3 | Sport facilities; golf course, tennis court, cricket oval, ski run, race track | |
| ILLSUB24 | 0 - 3 | Winter/snow | |
| ILLSUB25 | 0 - 3 | Map | |
| ILLSUB26 | 0 - 3 | Literature/brochures/ pamphlets | |
| ILLSUB27 | 0 - 3 | Transportation vehicles; plane, bus, ferry, carriage | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| ILLSUB28 | 0 - 3 | Flowers/plants | |
| ILLSUB29 | 0 - 3 | Other | |
| ACTIVITY | 0 | Passive/leisurely | Assess pace of illustration and people shown in it. |
| | 1 | Active/energetic | |
| PPLDO1 | 0 - 1 | Boating/sailing/ rafting | Tourists in ILLSUB8 are shown participating (1) or not participating (0) in each category. If no tourists shown, leave blank. |
| PPLDO2 | 0 - 1 | Watersport; swimming, diving, scuba diving, water skiing, sailboarding | |
| PPLDO3 | 0 - 1 | Adventure; riding, hiking, fishing, camping, ballooning | |
| PPLDO4 | 0 - 1 | Skiing | |
| PPLDO5 | 0 - 1 | Golf/tennis | |
| PPLDO6 | 0 - 1 | Sightseeing/touring/ spectators/shopping | |
| PPLDO7 | 0 - 1 | Relaxing; strolling, playing, sunbathing, lounging | |
| PPLDO8 | 0 - 1 | Eating/cooking/ drinking | |
| PPLDO9 | 0 - 1 | Socializing; 3+ people, family, companionship, partying | |
| PPLDO10 | 0 - 1 | Romance - couple, bride | |
| PPLDO11 | 0 - 1 | Other | |
| PPLSEX1 | 0 - 1 | Male only | Sex of tourists (ILLSUB8) shown in ad. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. If no tourists shown, leave blank. |
| PPLSEX2 | 0 - 1 | Female only | |
| PPLSEX3 | 0 - 1 | Both sexes | |
| PPLSEX4 | 0 - 1 | Sex/age unclear | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| PPLAGE1 | 0 - 1 | Children | Age of tourists (ILLSUB8) shown in ad. Code each as present (1), absent (0) or no tourists shown (blank). |
| PPLAGE2 | 0 - 1 | Seniors | |
| TEST1 | 0 - 1 | Celebrity/expert testimonial | Use of testimonial in ad. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| TEST2 | 0 - 1 | Citizen testimonial | |
| TEST3 | 0 - 1 | No testimonial | |
| EFFECTS1 | 0 - 1 | Mist/spray | Use of special lighting effects. For each code present (1), or absent (0). |
| EFFECTS2 | 0 - 1 | Orange/yellow light | |
| EFFECTS3 | 0 - 1 | Pink/lilac light | |
| EFFECTS4 | 0 - 1 | Reflections off water | |
| EFFECTS5 | 0 - 1 | Night floodlighting | - Exclude city lights panorama (ILLSUB1) |
| EFFECTS6 | 0 - 1 | None of above effects | |
| ILLTXT1 | 0 - 1 | Above text | Position of the illustration relative to the text. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| ILLTXT2 | 0 - 1 | Below text | |
| ILLTXT3 | 0 - 1 | Next to text | |
| ILLTXT4 | 0 - 1 | Text superimposed | |
| ILLTXT5 | 0 - 1 | No illustration/ text | |

## A3 - VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ASSOCIATION

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Main Identifier and Signature:** | | | Placement of all mentions of the destination name. For each code:<br>0 = Not in this position<br>1 = Minor reference (smallest, not prominent)<br>2 = Secondary identifier (smaller, less prominent than 3)<br>3 = Main identifier (most prominent) |
| IDENT1 | 0 - 3 | Is headline | - Only word in headline is destination name. |
| IDENT2 | 0 - 3 | Headline subject | |
| IDENT3 | 0 - 3 | Headline object | |
| IDENT4 | 0 - 3 | Part of headline | - Other inclusion<br>Also recoded as: HDID = Name in headline |
| IDENT5 | 0 - 3 | Themeline subject | |
| IDENT6 | 0 - 3 | Themeline object | |
| IDENT7 | 0 - 3 | Part of themeline | - Other inclusion<br>Also recoded as: THEMEID = Name in themeline |
| IDENT8 | 0 - 3 | Logo/Signature in coupon | |
| IDENT9 | 0 - 3 | Logo/Signature elsewhere | Also recoded as: LOGOID = Name in logo or distinctive signature. |
| IDENT10 | 0 - 3 | Part of name/ address in coupon | |
| IDENT11 | 0 - 3 | Part of name/ address elsewhere | Also recoded as: ADDID = Name in an address. |
| IDENT12 | 0 - 3 | In text | |
| IDENT13 | 0 - 3 | In caption | |
| IDENT14 | 0 - 3 | On brochure/ literature/ vacation planner | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIG1 to SIGN14 | 0 - 1 | As IDENT1 to IDENT14 | Placement of Starch Identified Signature. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| IDSIZE | 1 | Less prominent than headline text | Prominence of Main Identifier compared to headline. |
| | 2 | Same as headline | |
| | 3 | More prominent than headline text | |
| | 4 | Is headline | - Headline is Main Identifier. No other text in headline. |
| SIGSIZE | 1 - 4 | As IDSIZE | Prominence of Starch Identified Signature compared to headline. |
| IDPCT | 0 - 100 | Main Identifier as a percent of space | $\frac{L(ID) \times H(ID)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ where H(ID) = height from top of largest capital to bottom of descender (if present). - If Main Identifier is included in headline, measure destination name only. |
| SIGPCT | 0 - 100 | Starch Identified Signature as percent of ad space | $\frac{L(Sig) \times H(Sig)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ - Signature space includes full logo, illustration, address, themeline or co-sponsoring signature where present. - If signature is in written form only, height is measured from top of largest capital to bottom of descender (if present). |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| IDHITE | 0 - 100 | Height of main identifier as a percent of height of ad | $\frac{H(ID)}{H(Ad)}$ x 100 where H = height of largest capital in name. |
| SIGHITE | 0 - 100 | Height of Starch Identified Signature as a percent of height of ad. | As IDHITE |
| | | | Position of Main Identifier in ad. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others: |
| IDPSN1 | 0 - 1 | Spread across top | - Across 2 + columns and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN2 | 0 - 1 | Top left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN3 | 0 - 1 | Top centre | - In centre of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN4 | 0 - 1 | Top right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: IDPOSN1 = Top |
| IDPSN5 | 0 - 1 | Spread across middle | - Across 2 + columns and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN6 | 0 - 1 | Middle left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN7 | 0 - 1 | Middle centre | - In centre of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN8 | 0 - 1 | Middle right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: IDPOSN2 = Middle |
| IDPSN9 | 0 - 1 | Spread across bottom | - Across 2 + columns and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN10 | 0 - 1 | Bottom left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| IDPSN11 | 0 - 1 | Bottom centre | - In centre of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| IDPSN12 | 0 - 1 | Bottom right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: IDPOSN3 = Bottom |
| IDPSN13 | 0 - 1 | Left column | - In left 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| IDPSN14 | 0 - 1 | Centre column | - In centre of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| IDPSN15 | 0 - 1 | Right column | - In right 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| IDPSN16 | 0 - 1 | Several scattered | |
| SIGPSN1 - SIGNPSN15 | 0 - 1 | As IDPSN1 - IDPSN15 | Position of Starch Identified signature in ad. |
| IDPRES1 | 0 - 1 | Destination name only | Presentation of Main Identifier. For each, code present (1) or absent (0). |
| IDPRES2 | 0 - 1 | Includes an address | |
| IDPRES3 | 0 - 1 | Includes a theme-line | |
| IDPRES4 | 0 - 1 | Includes an illus-tration | - logo, picture, foreign lettering, design |
| IDPRES5 | 0 - 1 | Reverse type | |
| IDPRES6 | 0 - 1 | Print in colour | - lettering in colour |
| IDPRES7 | 0 - 1 | Includes (an)other colour | - uses two or more colours anywhere |
| IDPRES8 | 0 - 1 | Not horizontal | |
| SIGPRES1 to SIGPRES8 | 0 - 1 | As IDPRES1 - IDPRES8 | Presentation of Starch Identified signature. |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| Headline: | | | |
| HEADAPP1 | 0 - 1 | Reverse type | Presentation of headline. For each code present (1) or absent (0). |
| HEADAPP2 | 0 - 1 | Print in colour | |
| HEADAPP3 | 0 - 1 | All upper case (1 size) | |
| HEADAPP4 | 0 - 1 | Not horizontal | |
| | | | Position of headline in ad. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| HDPSN1 | 0 - 1 | Spread across top | - Across 2 + columns and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN2 | 0 - 1 | Top left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN3 | 0 - 1 | Top centre | - In centre of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN4 | 0 - 1 | Top right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: HEADPSN1 = Top |
| HDPSN5 | 0 - 1 | Spread across middle | - Across 2 + columns and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN6 | 0 - 1 | Middle left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN7 | 0 - 1 | Middle centre | - In centre of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN8 | 0 - 1 | Middle right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: HEADPSN2 = Middle |
| HDPSN9 | 0 - 1 | Spread across bottom | - Across 2 + columns and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN10 | 0 - 1 | Bottom left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN11 | 0 - 1 | Bottom centre | - In centre of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| HDPSN12 | 0 - 1 | Bottom right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: HEADPSN3 = Bottom |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| HDPSN13 | 0 - 1 | Left column | - In left 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| HDPSN14 | 0 - 1 | Centre column | - In centre of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| HDPSN15 | 0 - 1 | Right column | - In right 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| HDPSN16 | 0 - 1 | More than 1 place | |
| HDPSN17 | 0 - 1 | No headline | |
| HEADILL1 | 0 - 1 | Superimposed on illustration | Position of the headline relative to the illustration and text. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| HEADILL2 | 0 - 1 | Above illustration | |
| HEADILL3 | 0 - 1 | Below illustration | |
| HEADILL4 | 0 - 1 | Next to illustration | |
| HEADILL5 | 0 - 1 | Above text | |
| HEADILL6 | 0 - 1 | Below text | |
| HEADILL7 | 0 - 1 | Next to text | |
| HEADILL8 | 0 - 1 | Between illustration and text | |
| HEADLNS | Actual | | # lines in headline |
| HEADWDS | Actual | | # words in headline |
| HEADPCT | 0 - 100 | Headline as a percent of ad space | $\frac{L(HD) \times H(HD)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ where H(HD) = height from top of largest capital to bottom of descender (if present) |
| HEADHITE | 0 - 100 | Height of headline as a percent of height of ad | $\frac{H(HD)}{H(Ad)} \times 100$ where H(HD) = height of largest capital in headline |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| HEADCNT1 | 0 - 1 | Personal reference (you, your) | Phrasing and content of headline. For each code present (1) or absent (2). |
| HEADCNT2 | 0 - 1 | Interrogative | |
| HEADCNT3 | 0 - 1 | Imperative | |
| HEADCNT4 | 0 - 1 | Offers newness/ news about | |
| HEADCNT5 | 0 - 1 | Offers user benefit (outcome referent) | |
| HEADCNT6 | 0 - 1 | Descriptive of destination (product referent, physical properties) | |
| HEADCNT7 | 0 - 1 | Imagery, expressive-ness (user referent, not intrinsic to product) | |

## A4 - VARIABLES CONTRIBUTING TO ELABORATION

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| Text: | | | |
| TXTPRES1 | 0 - 1 | Interspersed with pictures | Presentation of text. For each code present (1) or absent (0). |
| TXTPRES2 | 0 - 1 | Paragraph headings | |
| TXTPRES3 | 0 - 1 | Text with numbered points | |
| TXTPRES4 | 0 - 1 | Captions to photos | |
| TXTPRES5 | 0 - 1 | Most text in captions | |
| TXTPRES6 | 0 - 1 | Not horizontal | |
| TXTPRES7 | 0 - 1 | No text | |
| | | | Position of text in ad. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. |
| TXTPSN1 | 0 - 1 | Spread across top | - Across 2 + columns and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN2 | 0 - 1 | Top left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN3 | 0 - 1 | Top centre | - In centre of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN4 | 0 - 1 | Top right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in top 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: TXTPOSN1 = Top |
| TXTPSN5 | 0 - 1 | Spread across middle | - Across 2 + columns and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN6 | 0 - 1 | Middle left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN7 | 0 - 1 | Middle centre | - In centre of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN8 | 0 - 1 | Middle right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in middle 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: TXTPOSN2 = Middle |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| TXTPSN9 | 0 - 1 | Spread across bottom | - Across 2 + columns and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN10 | 0 - 1 | Bottom left | - In left 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN11 | 0 - 1 | Bottom centre | - In centre of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad |
| TXTPSN12 | 0 - 1 | Bottom right | - In right 1/2 of ad and in lower 1/3 - 1/2 of ad<br>Also recoded as: TXTPOSN3 = Bottom |
| TXTPSN13 | 0 - 1 | Left column | - In left 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| TXTPSN14 | 0 - 1 | Centre column | - In centre of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| TXTPSN15 | 0 - 1 | Right column | - In right 1/2 of ad and height greater than 1/2 of height of ad |
| TXTPSN16 | 0 - 1 | Scattered | |
| TXTPSN17 | 0 - 1 | Over 1/2 of ad | |
| TXTCOL01 | 0 - 2 | Black on white | Background and print colour. For each code:<br>0 = Not present<br>1 = Secondary combination<br>2 = Main combination |
| TXTCOL02 | 0 - 2 | Black on solid colour* | |
| TXTCOL03 | 0 - 2 | Black on illustration | |
| TXTCOL04 | 0 - 2 | Reverse on solid colour* | - Include captions, exclude coupons and logos. |
| TXTCOL05 | 0 - 2 | Reverse on illustration | * Solid colour background may be part of illustration, eg. sky in photo. |
| TXTCOL06 | 0 - 2 | Colour on white | |
| TXTCOL07 | 0 - 2 | Colour on black | |
| TXTCOL08 | 0 - 2 | Colour on solid colour* | |
| TXTCOL09 | 0 - 2 | Colour on illustration | |
| TXTCOL10 | 0 - 2 | Reverse on black | |
| CAPNLN | Actual | | Average # lines in captions to photos. |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| COPYBLKS | Actual | | # blocks of copy in main text |
| COPYLNS | Actual | | # lines of copy in main text |
| NO. WORDS | 01 - 15 | < 49 to 749 in increments of 50 | # of words in main text (estimated) |
| TXTPCT | 0 - 100 | Text as a percent of ad space | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{L(Text) \times H(Text)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ where i = block of text - Include all blocks of text but exclude captions unless these make up 50%+ of the text. |
| TYPEHITE | Actual | Modal type size ratio in main text | Ratio = # of lines of type per 10% of height of ad. |
| NO.TYPES | Actual | | # of type styles and sizes in main text |
| INFO | 1 | Strongly general/ descriptive | Rating of specificity of information in text. |
| | 2 | More general than specific | |
| | 3 | Mixed | |
| | 4 | More factual/ specific than general | |
| | 5 | Strongly factual/ specific | |
| CONTENT1 | 0 - 1 | Price/reductions/ special offers | Information contained in text. For each code present (1) or absent (0) |
| CONTENT2 | 0 - 1 | Distance/service/ transportation/ accommodation | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| CONTENT3 | 0 - 1 | Vacation planners/ literature/infor- mation source/ coupon | |
| CONTENT4 | 0 - 1 | Specific place names/things to see and do | |
| CONTENT5 | 0 - 1 | Natural/cultural/ historical/ background | |
| CONTENT6 | 0 - 1 | Statistics/# of .../dates | |
| APPEAL1 | 0 - 2 | Hospitality/ friendliness/ welcome/invitation | Appeals used in written form. For each code:<br>0 = Not present<br>1 = Secondary (in themeline, captions, text; one component only)<br>2 = Main appeal (in headline; in two or more components) |
| APPEAL2 | 0 - 2 | Nature/wildlife/ scenic beauty/ wilderness/ countryside | |
| APPEAL3 | 0 - 2 | Comparisons with other destinations/ the best, greatest, better ... | |
| APPEAL4 | 0 - 2 | Everything in one country. | |
| APPEAL5 | 0 - 2 | General desire- ability/status | |
| APPEAL6 | 0 - 2 | Discover/unspoiled/ surprise | |
| APPEAL7 | 0 - 2 | Emotions: touching/ moving/wonder/ fascination/dream/ pleasure/enchanting/ exciting/happy | |
| APPEAL8 | 0 - 2 | Value/$ stretches/ not expensive/ exchange rate | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| APPEAL9 | 0 - 2 | Memories/memorable | |
| APPEAL10 | 0 - 2 | Good vacation destination | |
| APPEAL11 | 0 - 2 | Superlatives: magnificent/super/wunderbar/spectacular/breath-taking/incredible/awesome | |
| APPEAL12 | 0 - 2 | Spring/fall | |
| APPEAL13 | 0 - 2 | Variety/diversity/choice/lots to see and do | |
| APPEAL14 | 0 - 2 | Accessibility | |
| APPEAL15 | 0 - 2 | Lack of crowding/privacy/short line-ups | |
| APPEAL16 | 0 - 2 | Urban/city appeal | |
| APPEAL17 | 0 - 2 | Foreignness/differentness/unique appeals | |
| APPEAL18 | 0 - 2 | Beaches and sea | |
| APPEAL19 | 0 - 2 | Resorts | |
| APPEAL20 | 0 - 2 | History and culture/performing and visual arts/festivals/historic places | |
| APPEAL21 | 0 - 2 | Climate/sun/warmth/negative conditions at home | |
| APPEAL22 | 0 - 2 | Relax/slow down/quiet | |
| APPEAL23 | 0 - 2 | Winter/skiing | |
| APPEAL24 | 0 - 2 | Food/cuisine/restaurants | |
| APPEAL25 | 0 - 2 | Night life/casinos/discos/shows | |
| APPEAL26 | 0 - 2 | English-speaking | |
| APPEAL27 | 0 - 2 | Accommodation | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| APPEAL28 | 0 - 2 | Shopping | |
| APPEAL29 | 0 - 2 | Sports: golf/tennis/ sailing/fishing/ riding | |
| EMOTION | 0 | Not | Rating of evocativeness of text (fantasy/imagery/atmosphere) |
| | 1 | Somewhat | |
| | 2 | Highly | |
| Call-to-Action: | | | |
| OFFER2 | 0 - 1 | Sweepstakes | Offers made in ad. For each code present (1) or absent (0). |
| OFFER3 | 0 - 1 | Coupon | |
| OFFER4 | 0 - 1 | Directive in text (any) | |
| OFFER5 | 0 - 1 | Phone/800 number | |
| COUPSHP1 | 0 - 1 | Horizontal rectangle | Shape of coupon. Code as present (1) in one position, absent (0) in others. If no coupon in ad, leave blank. |
| COUPSHP2 | 0 - 1 | Vertical rectangle | |
| COUPSHP3 | 0 - 1 | Square | |
| COUPSHP4 | 0 - 1 | Triangle | |
| COUPSHP5 | 0 - 1 | Irregular | |
| BORDER1 | 0 - 1 | Dotted line | Coupon border/contrast with rest of ad. Code as present (1), absent (0), or blank if no coupon. |
| BORDER2 | 0 - 1 | Solid line | |
| BORDER3 | 0 - 1 | Colour contrast | |
| BORDER4 | 0 - 1 | No border/contrast | |
| COUPCOL1 | 0 - 1 | White on white | Coupon and background colour. Code as present in one combination (1), absent in others (0) or blank if no coupon. |
| COUPCOL2 | 0 - 1 | White on colour | |
| COUPCOL3 | 0 - 1 | White on illu- stration | |
| COUPCOL4 | 0 - 1 | Colour on white | |
| COUPCOL5 | 0 - 1 | Colour on same colour (super- imposed) | |

| Variable | Codes | Value Label | Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|
| COUPCOL6 | 0 - 1 | Colour on contrast colour | |
| COUPCOL7 | 0 - 1 | Colour on illustration | |
| COUPCOL8 | 0 - 1 | Illustration on illustration | |
| COUPOSN1 | 0 - 1 | Across bottom of ad | Position of coupon in ad. Code as present in one position (1), absent (0) in others or blank if no coupon. |
| COUPOSN2 | 0 - 1 | Lower right corner | |
| COUPOSN3 | 0 - 1 | Lower left corner | |
| COUPOSN4 | 0 - 1 | Elsewhere | |
| COUPPCT | 0 - 100 | Coupon as a percent of ad space | $\frac{L(C) \times H(C)}{L(Ad) \times H(Ad)} \times 100$ - Adapt for triangles and irregular forms. |

## APPENDIX B

### B1: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT NOTED SCORE

| | Noted Score* Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Bleed | .1883 |
| Main and inset photos | -.1520 |
| Main Identifier: | |
| Includes illustration | -.1522 |
| Bottom right corner position | .1202 |
| Spread over bottom of ad | .1119 |
| Main Text: | |
| Percent of ad | -.1721 |
| Lower left corner position | -.1272 |
| Spread over bottom of ad | -.1030 |
| Spread over middle of ad | -.0827 |
| Headline: | |
| Between illustration and text | .1079 |
| Not horizontal | .1039 |
| Imperative | -.1023 |
| Print in colour | .1016 |
| Number of words | -.0838 |
| Call-to-action: | |
| Percent of ad | -.1981 |
| White on illustration | .1071 |
| CONTENT | |
| Illustration: | |
| Food/restaurant | -.2101 |
| Both sexes | -.1538 |
| Beaches/coast | .1382 |
| Visual arts/crafts/artifacts | -.1136 |
| Romance | .1030 |
| Mist/spray | -.0935 |
| Countryside | -.0818 |
| Written Message: | |
| Information source | -.3004 |
| Statistics/dates | -.1227 |
| Discovery/surprise | .1352 |
| Lack of crowding | -.1199 |

| Noted Score* | Beta |
|---|---|
| COMMUNICATION | |
| Foreign ad | .2080 |
| Page number | -.1749 |
| Right hand page | .1279 |

* All significant at .000 level.

## B2: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT ASSOCIATION RATE

| | Association Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Vertical rectangle | -.1418** |
| On left of ad | .1186** |
| Square | .0895* |
| Main Identifier: | |
| Percent of height of ad | .1761**** |
| Top right corner | .1500*** |
| In address elsewhere | .1136* |
| Name on literature/brochure | .1135** |
| Includes themeline | .1108** |
| Bottom right corner | -.1068* |
| Middle centre position | -.0993* |
| Main Text: | |
| Black on white background | -.3167**** |
| With captions | .1674**** |
| Black on illustration | -.1140** |
| With numbered points | .1137** |
| Colour on white background | -.1077** |
| Headline: | |
| Not horizontal | .1206** |
| In several places | .1059* |
| Spread over middle of ad | .1043* |
| Call-to-action: | |
| Across bottom of ad | -.2352**** |
| Lower right corner | -.1233** |
| White on colour | -.1077** |
| Phone/800 number | .1012* |
| Colour on contrast colour | -.0863* |
| CONTENT | |
| Headline: | |
| Offers news/newness | -.0949* |
| Written Message: | |
| Background information on destination | .1041* |

| COMMUNICATION | Association Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| Page number of ad | .1487*** |
| Foreign destination | -.1129* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## B3: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT MAIN IDENTIFIER READERSHIP

| | Main Identifier Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Number of illustrations | -.1982**** |
| Centred in ad | .1474** |
| Square shape | .1261** |
| Scattered around ad | .1243** |
| 2 - 3 photos | .0927* |
| Main Identifier: | |
| Percent of height of ad | .1632*** |
| Part of headline | -.1577** |
| Top right corner | .1286** |
| Main Text: | |
| Black on colour background | .2136**** |
| Reverse on illustration | .1490** |
| Reverse on black | .1308** |
| Not horizontal | -.1207** |
| Spread across bottom | -.1149* |
| Top left corner | .1106* |
| Top right corner | .1008* |
| Headline: | |
| Upper case in one size only | .1275** |
| Next to illustration | .0953* |
| CONTENT | |
| Illustration: | |
| Cityscape by day | .1003* |
| Map | -.0909* |
| Written Message: | |
| Comparisons with other destinations | .1573*** |
| Superlative | .1376** |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## B4: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT SIGNATURE READERSHIP

| | Starch Identified Signature Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Horizontal rectangle | -.2113**** |
| Signature: | |
| Starch Signature is Main Identifier | .4807**** |
| Visibility in comparison with headline | .1778*** |
| Not horizontal | -.1265*** |
| Bottom centre | .0977* |
| Main Text: | |
| Black on white | -.1146**** |
| Top right | .0786* |
| Headline: | |
| Bottom centre | -.1251** |
| Personal reference | .1122** |
| Next to illustration | .0925* |
| Bottom right | .0795* |
| CONTENT | |
| Written Message: | |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | .1828**** |
| Comparisons with other destinations | .1163** |
| Accessibility | .1128** |
| Cuisine/restaurants | .0777* |
| COMMUNICATION | |
| Page number of ad | .1555**** |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## B5: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT READ SOME READERSHIP RATE

| | Read Some Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Scattered around ad | .1476** |
| Main Identifier: | |
| In address elsewhere | .1200* |
| Main Text: | |
| Reverse on illustration | .1388** |
| Type size ratio | -.1250** |
| Spread across middle of ad | -.0944* |
| Headline: | |
| Spread across top of ad | .1080* |
| Number of lines | .1003* |
| Next to illustration | -.0926* |
| Call-to-Action: | |
| No border | -.1562*** |
| Lower right corner | .1460** |
| CONTENT | |
| Illustration: | |
| Unique landforms | -.1303** |
| Pink/lilac light | -.1300** |
| Sports facilities | .1023* |
| Headline: | |
| Offers news/newness | -.1180* |
| Written Message: | |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | .1276** |
| Natural appeal | -.1143* |
| Memories/memorability | -.1013* |

| | Read Some Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| COMMUNICATION | |
| General magazine | .2302**** |
| Page number of ad | .1999**** |
| Women's magazine | -.1639* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## B6: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT READ MOST READERSHIP RATE

| | Read Most Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Main Identifier: | |
| In address elsewhere | .1701**** |
| Includes themeline | .1261** |
| Spread across top of ad | -.1235* |
| Is headline | -.1165** |
| Includes illustration | -.1093* |
| Main Text: | |
| Type size ratio | -.2968**** |
| Black on white | -.1907**** |
| Headline: | |
| Below illustration | .2211**** |
| Spread across top of ad | .1353** |
| CONTENT | |
| Written Message: | |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | .1889**** |
| Superlatives | -.0987* |
| Evocativeness of text | -.0929* |
| COMMUNICATION | |
| Page number of ad | .1399** |
| General magazine | .1386*** |
| Foreign destination | .1109* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## B7: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF ALL VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT HEADLINE READERSHIP RATE

| | Headline Readership Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| MECHANICAL | |
| Illustration: | |
| Bottom up position | -.1386**** |
| Main and non-inset photos | .1298*** |
| Left side of ad | .1108** |
| Right side of ad | -.0975** |
| Main Identifier: | |
| Includes illustration | -.4231**** |
| Is headline subject | .1724**** |
| Top right corner | .1216** |
| Is headline object | .1053* |
| Percent of height of ad | .1035* |
| Main Text: | |
| Colour on illustration | .1257*** |
| Black on white background | -.0916* |
| Black on illustration | -.0905* |
| Reverse on colour | -.0881* |
| Headline: | |
| Percent of ad space | .3108**** |
| Number of words | -.2047**** |
| Bottom right corner | .1444**** |
| Top left corner | -.0945* |
| CONTENT | |
| Illustration: | |
| Accommodation | -.1539**** |
| Written Message: | |
| Comparison with other destinations | .1437**** |
| Information source | -.1074** |
| Services/distance | .0800* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## APPENDIX C

### C1: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES ENTERING SEPARATE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT NOTED SCORE

| | Noted Score Beta |
|---|---|
| **ILLUSTRATION** | |
| Bleed | .2520**** |
| One photo | .2261**** |
| Beaches/coast | .1778**** |
| Main and non-inset photos | .1568*** |
| Visual arts/crafts/artifacts | -.1508*** |
| Map | .1492*** |
| Water-rivers/lakes/sea | .1364** |
| Percent of ad | .1222* |
| Multiple photos | .1159* |
| Sport facilities | -.1116* |
| Romance | .1091* |
| Female only | .1023* |
| Illustration below text | -.0884* |
| Flowers | .0867* |
| **MAIN IDENTIFIER** | |
| In address elsewhere | -.1896*** |
| Name on literature/brochure | -.1866**** |
| In address in coupon | -.1745**** |
| Includes an illustration | -.1622*** |
| Name in text | -.1520*** |
| Name of destination only | .1459** |
| Middle centre | -.1340*** |
| Reverse type | .1089* |
| Includes themeline | .0998* |
| Bottom centre | -.0944* |
| **MAIN TEXT** | |
| Information source | -.3004**** |
| Percent of ad | -.1593*** |
| Everything in one country | .1489*** |
| Black on colour background | .1404** |
| Statistics/dates | -.1382** |
| Text interspersed with pictures | .1093* |
| **HEADLINE** | |
| Headline below illustration | .2094**** |
| Bottom spread | .1654**** |
| Several places | -.1500*** |
| Offers news/newness | -.1442** |
| Offers benefit | -.1382** |
| Imperative | -.1290** |
| Above illustration | -.1079* |

Noted Score

| | Beta |
|---|---|
| CALL-TO-ACTION | |
| Percent of ad | -.2391**** |
| Phone/800 number | -.1664**** |
| Lower left corner | -.1560*** |
| No border | -.1470** |
| Text directive | -.1291** |
| STARCH IDENTIFIED SIGNATURE | |
| Includes an illustration | -.1968**** |
| Reverse type | .1420** |
| Bottom centre | -.1273** |
| Name of destination only | .1256* |
| Bottom left | -.1248** |
| Logo/signature in coupon | -.1077* |
| Themeline object | .1030* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C2: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES ENTERING SEPARATE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT ASSOCIATION RATE

| | Association Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| **ILLUSTRATION** | |
| Vertical rectangle | -.2164**** |
| Number of illustrations | -.1843**** |
| Male and female tourists | .1744**** |
| Illustration above text | -.1543** |
| Photo and drawing | -.1285** |
| Multiple drawings | -.1125* |
| Night lighting | -.1033* |
| **MAIN IDENTIFIER** | |
| Percent of height of ad | .2375**** |
| Top right corner | .1730**** |
| Name is headline subject | .1688**** |
| Lower centre | .1686**** |
| Name is themeline object | .1640**** |
| Includes a themeline | .1596** |
| Name in caption | .1140* |
| Reverse type | .1081* |
| Includes an illustration | -.1078* |
| **MAIN TEXT** | |
| Black on white background | -.3167**** |
| With captions | .1997**** |
| Comparisons with other destinations | .1560**** |
| Evocativeness of text | .1457*** |
| Black on illustration | -.1210** |
| Bottom centre | -.1200** |
| Foreign/different | -.1151* |
| Diversity/choice | -.0971* |
| Animals/fish/birds | .0941* |
| **HEADLINE** | |
| Percent of ad | .1982**** |
| Reverse type | .1573*** |
| Top right corner | .1570*** |
| Descriptive of destination | -.1445** |
| Bottom spread | -.1039* |
| Offers news/newness | -.1032* |
| **CALL-TO-ACTION** | |
| Solid line | -.1827**** |
| Across bottom of ad | -.1137* |
| Colour contrast | .1125* |
| Colour on same colour | .1064* |

| | Association Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| STARCH IDENTIFIED SIGNATURE | |
| Bottom centre | .2012**** |
| Includes an illustration | -.1956**** |
| Starch Signature is main identifier | -.1683*** |
| Percent of ad | .1657**** |
| Includes themeline | .1572*** |
| Middle right | .1050* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C3: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES ENTERING SEPARATE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT READ SOME READERSHIP RATE

| | Read Some Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| **ILLUSTRATION** | |
| Mountains | -.1576** |
| Bleed | .1465** |
| Other illustration | -.1409** |
| Scattered illustrations | .1338** |
| Unique landforms | -.1338** |
| Male and female tourists | .1104* |
| **MAIN IDENTIFIER** | |
| In address in coupon | -.1419** |
| Name of destination only | .1297* |
| Bottom spread | -.1061* |
| Name is headline | -.1021* |
| Not horizontal | -.1020* |
| **MAIN TEXT** | |
| Number of type styles/sizes | .1924** |
| Natural appeal | -.1434** |
| Type size ratio | -.1365** |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | .1359** |
| With paragraph headings | -.1309** |
| Specific names | .1183* |
| With numbered points | .1114* |
| Nightlife | -.1019* |
| Good vacation destination | -.1004* |
| Black on illustration | -.0952* |
| **HEADLINE** | |
| Bottom centre | .1092* |
| One size upper case only | -.1073* |
| Spread across top | .1053* |
| **CALL-TO-ACTION** | |
| Lower right corner | .1458** |
| Percent of ad | -.1261* |
| No border | -.1183* |

| | Read Some Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| STARCH IDENTIFIED SIGNATURE | |
| Name of destination only | .1263* |
| Not horizontal | -.1229* |
| Spread across top | -.1150* |
| Themeline object | .1057* |
| Middle centre | -.1052* |
| Reverse type | .1014* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C4: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES ENTERING SEPARATE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT READ MOST READERSHIP RATE

| | Read Most Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| **ILLUSTRATION** | |
| Beaches/coast | .1855**** |
| Other illustration | -.1712**** |
| Male and female tourists | .1506** |
| Animals/fish/birds | -.1332** |
| Percent of ad | .1188* |
| Sunset | -.1127* |
| Photo and drawing | -.0936* |
| **MAIN IDENTIFIER** | |
| In address elsewhere | .1741**** |
| Includes themeline | .1567** |
| Name of destination only | .1448** |
| Includes an illustration | -.1397* |
| Bottom left corner | .1262** |
| Name in text | -.1057* |
| **MAIN TEXT** | |
| Type size ratio | -.2968**** |
| Percent of ad | -.1824*** |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | .1708*** |
| Scattered | .1386** |
| Number of type styles/sizes | .1214** |
| Natural appeal | -.1150** |
| Bottom centre | -.1108* |
| With paragraph headings | -.1053* |
| With numbered points | .1020* |
| **HEADLINE** | |
| Headline below illustration | .1952**** |
| Spread across top | .1160* |
| Personal reference | .1018* |
| **CALL-TO-ACTION** | |
| Percent of ad | -.1601*** |
| Bottom left corner | -.1448** |
| Text directive | -.1179* |
| No border | -.1036* |

| | Read Most Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| STARCH IDENTIFIED SIGNATURE | |
| Includes an illustration | -.1908**** |
| Not horizontal | -.1341** |
| Starch Signature is Main Identifier | .1307** |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C5: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF DESTINATION NAME VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSIONS TO PREDICT MAIN IDENTIFIER AND STARCH SIGNATURE READERSHIP RATES

| | Main Identifier Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| **MAIN IDENTIFIER** | |
| Percent of height of ad | .1723*** |
| In logo/signature in coupon | -.1336* |
| Bottom centre | .1284* |
| Top left corner | -.1004** |

| | Signature Readership Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| **SIGNATURE** | |
| Starch Signature is Main Identifier | .4807**** |
| Includes a themeline | .1799**** |
| Percent of ad | .1706**** |
| Bottom centre | .1487**** |
| Name of destination only | .1092* |
| Logo/signature elsewhere | -.0977* |
| Middle left | .0819* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C6: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF HEADLINE VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT HEADLINE READERSHIP RATE

| | Headline Readership Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| HEADLINE | |
| Percent of ad | .4174**** |
| Destination name is headline subject | .2111**** |
| Number of words | -.2005**** |
| Destination name is headline | .1966**** |
| Destination name is headline object | .1647**** |
| Destination name is part headline | .1603**** |
| Top left corner | -.1403*** |
| Descriptive of destination | -.1332*** |
| Personal reference | .1135** |
| Below illustration | .1116** |
| Middle spread | .1009* |
| Between illustration and text | -.0885* |
| Middle left | -.0809* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## C7: BETA COEFFICIENTS OF CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES ENTERING STEPWISE REGRESSION TO PREDICT COUPON READERSHIP RATE

| | Coupon Readership Rate Beta |
|---|---|
| CALL-TO-ACTION | |
| Destination name in address in coupon | -.4335*** |
| Percent of ad | .3357**** |
| Across bottom | -.2719** |
| No border | -.1952* |

**** .000 significance level.
*** .001 significance level.
** .01 significance level.
* .05 significance level.

## APPENDIX D

### D1: COMMUNICATION VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foreign | 274 | | | ++ | |
| Co-sponsor | 72 | | | | - |
| Travel magazine | 214 | | | ---- | ---- |
| General magazine | 44 | | | ++++ | ++++ |
| Women's magazine | 42 | | | | ++ |
| Year of publication* | 426 | | ++++ | + | + |
| Month of publication* | 425 | -- | | | |
| Page number* | 424 | | | ++++ | ++++ |
| Right-hand side | 327 | + | - | | |
| Colour of ad* | 567 | ++++ | | ---- | ---- |
| Vertical in shape | 467 | ---- | | | |
| Size of ad* | 567 | ++++ | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Significant at: | + | .05 level |
| | ++ | .01 level |
| | +++ | .001 level |
| | ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D2: MECHANICAL ILLUSTRATION VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EXECUTION | | | | | |
| Bleed | 270 | ++++ | | + | + |
| Photos - total | 383 | ++ | ++ | | |
| -1 main and non-inset | 73 | | ++ | | |
| -1 main and inset(s) | 83 | ---- | ++ | | |
| -1 photo | 170 | ++++ | | | |
| Mixed - photo and drawing | 30 | -- | | | |
| Drawing - total | 13 | | - | | |
| -1 drawing | 5 | | - | | |
| -multiple drawings | 8 | - | - | | |
| QUANTITY | | | | | |
| Number of illustrations* | 426 | --- | | | |
| Percent of ad which is illustration* | 426 | +++ | | | ++ |
| SHAPE | | | | | |
| Horizontal rectangle | 36 | | | | --- |
| Vertical rectangle | 131 | | --- | | |
| Square | 10 | | + | | |
| POSITION | | | | | |
| Full ad | 112 | | + | | |
| Top down | 117 | + | -- | - | |
| Left | 14 | | | | - |
| Scattered | 47 | | + | + | |
| Above text | 166 | | ---- | | |
| Text superimposed | 134 | | +++ | | |

| Significant at: | | |
|---|---|---|
| | + | .05 level |
| | ++ | .01 level |
| | +++ | .001 level |
| | ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D3: ILLUSTRATION MESSAGE (CONTENT) VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUBJECTS | | | | | |
| Food/restaurant* | 426 | ---- | | + | |
| Tourists* | 426 | | | + | +++ |
| Ethnic festivals/ performing arts* | 426 | - | - | | |
| Visual arts/crafts/ artifacts* | 426 | -- | | | |
| Nationals/hosts* | 426 | - | | | |
| Beaches/coast* | 426 | ++++ | | | ++++ |
| Boats/sails/rafts* | 426 | | | | + |
| Forest/trees* | 426 | ++ | | | |
| Mountains* | 426 | | | -- | - |
| Unique landforms* | | | | -- | |
| Sunset* | 426 | | | - | - |
| Animals/fish/birds* | 426 | | | | -- |
| Sports facilities* | 426 | - | + | | |
| Brochures/guides* | 426 | -- | | | |
| Other subject* | 426 | | | -- | ---- |
| Active/energetic | 162 | - | | | |
| TOURIST PARTICIPATION | | | | | |
| Boating | 52 | -- | | | |
| Other watersport | 42 | ++ | | + | + |
| Skiing | 32 | - | ---- | | |
| Golf/tennis | 34 | -- | | | |
| Relaxing | 128 | ++ | | | |
| Eating | 54 | -- | | | |
| Socializing | 80 | - | | | |
| Romance | 99 | +++ | ++++ | + | ++ |
| TOURISTS ARE | | | | | |
| Male only | 26 | - | | | - |
| Female only | 25 | ++++ | | | |
| Both | 219 | | | | ++ |
| Seniors | 19 | | ---- | | |

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Citizen testimonial | 18 | | + | + | |
| No special lighting | 304 | | | ++++ | + |
| Reflections off water | | | | - | |

Significant at:

| | |
|---|---|
| + | .05 level |
| ++ | .01 level |
| +++ | .001 level |
| ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D4: DESTINATION NAME VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | | Noted | | Association | | Read Some | | Read Most | | Read Name | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLACEMENT: | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig |
| In headline | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - total | 426* | 45 | | + | ++++ | + | | | --- | | | ++++ |
| - is headline | 426* | 24 | + | ++ | | + | | | | | | ++++ |
| - headline subject | 426* | | | | ++ | | | | | | | |
| In themeline | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - total | | 117 | | | | | + | | | + | | ++++ |
| - themeline subject | | 89 | | | | | | | | | | ++++ |
| - themeline object | 426* | 27 | + | + | + | + | | | + | + | | ++ |
| Logo/signature | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - total | 426* | 205 | | | - | - | | | | | - | ---- |
| - in coupon | 426* | 56 | --- | -- | - | | | | -- | -- | - | |
| - elsewhere | | 149 | | | | | | | | | | -- |
| Part of name/address | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - total | 426* | 51 | ---- | | - | | | | | | - | ---- |
| - in coupon | 426* | 39 | ---- | | | | -- | | ---- | | | ---- |
| - elsewhere | 426* | 12 | | | - | | + | | ++++ | | | -- |
| In text | 426* | | ---- | | | | | | ---- | | | |
| In caption | 426* | | | | + | | + | | | | | |
| On brochure/ literature | 426* | | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| SIZE: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Visibility in comparison with the headline* | 425 | 424 | | | ++++ | + | | | | | + | ++++ |
| Percent of ad which is name* | 426 | 425 | | | ++++ | ++ | | | | | | ++++ |
| Percent of ad height which is name height* | 426 | 425 | | | ++++ | + | | | | | ++++ | ++++ |

| | No. of Ads | | Noted | | Association | | Read Some | | Read Most | | Read Name | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig |
| **POSITION:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spread across top | 71 | 20 | | | +++ | | | | | | | ++ |
| Top left | 6 | | | | | | | | | | -- | |
| Top right | 13 | | | | +++ | | | | | | | |
| Middle left | 7 | 7 | + | ++ | | + | | | | | | + |
| Middle centre | 21 | | ---- | | - | | | | | | | |
| Middle right | | 22 | | | | ++ | | | | | | |
| Spread across bottom | 77 | 55 | ++++ | ++ | - | | | | | ++ | | |
| Bottom left | | 38 | | - | | | | | | | + | ++++ |
| Bottom centre | 36 | 42 | -- | - | ++ | ++++ | | | | - | | -- |
| Bottom right | 135 | 224 | | | -- | ---- | | | - | | + | ++ |
| Right column | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Left column | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **PRESENTATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Destination name only | 100 | 80 | ++++ | ++++ | | | | + | ++ | ++++ | | ++++ |
| Includes an address | | 64 | | | | | | | | | | ---- |
| Includes a theme line | | 166 | | | | +++ | | | | | | ++++ |
| Includes an illustration | 143 | 213 | ---- | ---- | -- | ---- | | - | | ---- | | |
| Reverse type | 121 | 61 | | + | +++ | +++ | | | | | | ++++ |
| Print in colour | | 120 | | | | | | | | | | + |
| Includes (an)other colour | 124 | 165 | - | ---- | - | | | | | | | |
| Not horizontal | 27 | 22 | | | | - | | - | - | -- | | - |

| | No. of Ads | | Noted | | Association | | Read Some | | Read Most | | Read Name | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig | ID | Sig |
| Signature is Main Identifier | 265 | 265 | | | | | | | ++ | ++ | ++++ | ++++ |

Significant at:

| | |
|---|---|
| + | .05 level |
| ++ | .01 level |
| +++ | .001 level |
| ++++ | .000 level |

+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D5: HEADLINE VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Headline Readership Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | | |
| Reverse type | 154 | | +++ | | | + |
| Print in colour | 70 | | | | | ++++ |
| All upper case (1 size) | 89 | | + | | | ++++ |
| POSITION: | | | | | | |
| Spread across top | 141 | | | | | ++ |
| Top left | 23 | | | | | ---- |
| Top right | 37 | | + | | | |
| Middle centre | 15 | --- | | | - | |
| Spread across bottom | 47 | ++ | - | - | - | + |
| Bottom left | 59 | ++ | --- | | ++ | ---- |
| Bottom right | 10 | | | | | + |
| Right column | 3 | | | | | ++ |
| More than one place | 22 | ---- | | - | - | |
| Superimposed on illustration | 215 | | | | | + |
| Above illustration | 80 | -- | | | | |
| Below illustration | 27 | ++++ | | | ++++ | |
| Next to illustration | 7 | | | - | - | |
| Below text | 12 | | | | | ++++ |
| Between illustration & text | 63 | + | | | | ---- |

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Headline Readership Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SIZE: | | | | | | |
| Number of words in headline* | 425 | - | | | | ---- |
| Percent of ad height which is headline* | 426 | | ++++ | | | ++++ |
| Percent of ad which is headline height* | 426 | + | +++ | | | ++++ |
| CONTENT: | | | | | | |
| Imperative | 79 | -- | | | | |
| Offers newness | 22 | ---- | | | | |
| Descriptive of destination | 90 | | --- | | | ---- |
| Imagery | 63 | | ++ | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Significant at: | + | .05 level |
| | ++ | .01 level |
| | +++ | .001 level |
| | ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D6: MECHANICAL TEXT VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRESENTATION: | | | | | |
| Paragraph headings | 110 | | | - | ---- |
| With numbered points | 5 | | ++ | | |
| Captions to photos | 121 | | ++++ | + | |
| Most text in captions | 21 | + | + | ++ | + |
| No text | 13 | ++ | | n/a | ++++ |
| POSITION: | | | | | |
| Bottom centre | 8 | | | + | -- |
| Right column | 18 | | | - | --- |
| Over 1/2 page | 4 | | + | | |
| COLOUR: | | | | | |
| Black on white* | 413 | | ---- | | - |
| Black on colour* | 413 | | ++++ | | |
| Reverse on illustration* | 413 | | ++++ | | |
| Colour on colour* | 413 | | | ++ | ++++ |
| SIZE: | | | | | |
| Number of lines of copy in main text* | 412 | ---- | | | ---- |
| Number of words in main text* | 412 | ---- | | | ---- |
| Percent of ad which is main text* | 412 | ---- | | | -- |
| Modal type size ratio in main text* | 413 | | | -- | -- |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Significant at: | + | .05 level |
| | ++ | .01 level |
| | +++ | .001 level |
| | ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

n/a Not applicable.

D7: TEXT CONTENT VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| INFORMATION CONTENT: | | | | | |
| Price/specials | 22 | | | | --- |
| Services/distance | 35 | | - | | ---- |
| Information source | 348 | ---- | | | |
| APPEALS USED: | | | | | |
| Hospitality/ friendliness | 426 | | ++ | | |
| Natural appeal | 425 | | - | -- | - |
| Comparisons with other destinations | 425 | | ++ | ++ | |
| Everything in one country | 425 | + | | | |
| Price value/exchange | 425 | | | | - |
| Memories/memorable | 425 | | ++ | | |
| Superlative | 425 | | | | - |
| Foreign/different | 425 | | - | | - |
| Beaches and sea | 425 | | ++ | | |
| History and culture | 425 | --- | | | - |
| Relax/quiet/slow down | 425 | + | ++++ | ++ | ++ |
| Skiing/winter | 425 | | - | | |
| Cuisine/restaurants | 425 | | | | - |
| Accommodation | 425 | + | | | -- |
| Evocativeness of text* | 414 | + | ++ | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Significant at: | + | .05 level |
| | ++ | .01 level |
| | +++ | .001 level |
| | ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

## D8: MECHANICAL CALL-TO-ACTION VARIABLES WITH A SIGNIFICANT UNIVARIATE IMPACT ON OVERALL READERSHIP

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Coupon Readership Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TYPE: | | | | | | |
| Coupon | 205 | ---- | | - | -- | n/a |
| Phone/800 number | 133 | - | | | | |
| COUPON SHAPE: | | | | | | |
| Horizontal rectangle | 138 | ++++ | | | ++++ | |
| Vertical rectangle | 27 | - | | | - | + |
| Triangle | 11 | | -- | | | --- |
| Irregular | 17 | - | | | - | |
| COUPON BORDER: | | | | | | |
| Dotted line | 160 | + | | ++ | ++ | |
| Solid line | 28 | | --- | | | |
| Colour contrast | 84 | | + | | | + |
| No border | 14 | | | - | - | - |
| COUPON COLOUR: | | | | | | |
| White on white | 67 | | - | | | - |
| Colour on illustration | 11 | | ++ | | | ++++ |
| Illustration on illustration | 14 | - | | | | |
| COUPON POSITION: | | | | | | |
| Across bottom | 29 | | ---- | | | |
| Lower right corner | 134 | + | | ++ | + | |
| Lower left corner | 29 | | + | | | |
| Elsewhere | 13 | -- | | | | |

| | No. of Ads | Noted Score | Association Rate | Read Some Rate | Read Most Rate | Coupon Readership Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of ad which is coupon* | 426 | ---- | | | -- | ++++ |

Significant at:

| | |
|---|---|
| + | .05 level |
| ++ | .01 level |
| +++ | .001 level |
| ++++ | .000 level |

\+ Means are significantly higher where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

\- Means are significantly lower where the item is present or as the variable increases in value.

* Interval measure; test is for linear relationships.

n/a Not applicable.